

WV VN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
The University of Memphis

John Willard Brister
Library
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

MSU LIBRARIES



3 2109 00134 1305

WITHDRAWN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
The University of Memphis

DATE DUE

MAIN LIBRN

DATE DUE

07.17.93

AIN LIBRN

DATE DUE

05 11.92

THE CHANGING SOUTH

by

WILLIAM J. ROBERTSON

BONI AND LIVERIGHT
PUBLISHERS NEW YORK

1927

Copyright, 1927, by
BONI AND LIVERIGHT, INC.

Printed in the United States of America

512.27 —

7
209
R65

To the Memory of
MAJOR PEACHY GILMER BRECKINRIDGE
OF VIRGINIA, 1835-1864,
AN ANTI-SECESSIONIST WHO DIED IN THE
CONFEDERATE GRAY,
THIS VOLUME IS INSCRIBED.

Magna est veritas, et praevalabit

FOREWORD

'A complete history of the South's struggles from the ruins of war waste and poverty to her present economic eminence is too encyclopedic to be confined within the limits of one volume. The purpose of these chapters, therefore, is merely to present a broad view of the leading factors, as the author sees them, which have shaped, and are continuing to shape, the section's notable political and religious solidarity, and to discuss the part the South is playing in the life of the Nation to-day.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I GENESIS	I
II CONFLICT	17
III RECONSTRUCTION	32
IV KU KLUX	47
V THE NEGRO	61
VI WHITE SUPREMACY	75
VII THE "BIBLE BELT"	92
VIII THE ONE LAW	107
IX SOCIAL CONDITIONS	120
X EDUCATION	136
XI THE PRESS	154
XII GREAT AND NEAR-GREAT	171
XIII IN CONGRESS	187
XIV TYPES	207
XV LITERATURE	224
XVI NEO-KU-KLUX	242
XVII THE TARIFF	260
XVIII ECONOMIC PROGRESS	273
XIX THE FUTURE	289
APPENDIX—THE SOUTH IN 1928?	302

THE CHANGING SOUTH

CHAPTER I

GENESIS

The Solid South is still loyal to three fundamental attitudes,—or fetishes, if you will,—which for more than three score years have made her a nation within a nation. And yet, withal, she has, during that time, passed through a marvelous transformation which, if she did not possess these attitudes, would make her as typically American as any other part of America. An ineffable charm she once possessed is to be found in her borders no more. The fragrance of the old roses of romance and chivalry which once haunted her mountains and meadows and seas is gone. Even her famous old-time hospitality has given way to new manners and customs. At last she has, as her business and industrial leaders like to put it, “come into her own.” In a section of the country where the very term “evolution” not so long ago was anathema to many of her spiritual leaders, evolution has raised her into new and amazing spheres of economic advancement.

Skylines that once pictured ancestral trees, to-day bear the outlines of factory stacks and skyscrapers. Hills and meadows that once knew only the deer and fox and the paths of the lonely mountain folk, support roadbeds of trunk line railroads and great highway systems. Vast fields that lay for centuries uncultivated now yield most of the foodstuffs that feed America. And acres of earth,

that for so many years appeared to have no value, yield the ores that largely supply the nation's mechanical needs. By a long, slow, painful process the Solid South has awakened from her old time lethargy and backwardness, and has built out of the ashes of war-ruin a new South that matches any other section in the country to-day, economically and culturally.

of old faith This change has been marked by unparalleled courage and persistence and vision. But with her progress agriculturally, industrially, commercially, mechanically and culturally, she loyally retains a trinity of deep-rooted convictions which are as much a part of her life now as they were the hour Lee surrendered his ragged troops to Grant in the little village at Appomattox.

The South is still solid politically. She is still solid in her love for the "Lost Cause." And she is still solid in refusing to recognize the rights of the Negro race which the Reconstruction Amendments to the Constitution gave it. Perhaps it will be generations before she consents to give up these three remaining marks of her old faith; or she may never give them up. No man knows. In any event, it should be of interest to many Americans, in view of the prominent, though ineffectual part, the South has played in National politics in recent years, to review the reasons why she has remained loyal for so long to one political tenet, why she has remembered with such devotion a defeated cause, and why she appears to be doing the Negro a grave injustice, while in other ways she has changed with the ever changing world around her.

The average American knows without being told that since the seceded States were readmitted to the Union in the early 70's the South, with the exception of Tennessee, has remained in the Democratic columns as regularly as there have been national elections. He probably has heard of the organizations of the Confederate Veterans, Sons of Veterans and Daughters of the Confederacy, which are living echoes of an unforgotten era of valor and sacrifice. And there certainly is not an adult American living who has not heard the political spellbinders quadrennially denounce the South for "nullifying" the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, thereby denying the Negro his civil rights and his right to vote. No logic, no humanitarian appeal, no amount of judicial reasoning for more than three score years has succeeded in making the South do otherwise; and probably never will. It is to describe the reasons for her persistent solidarity in these things and to review her remarkable growth and potentialities that this volume is written.

Until the year 1900 there was not a great deal of change in the South, economically or otherwise, to distinguish her from the South of 1861-1865. This was because she was slow to feel the influences of the economic forces which have made the past half a century one of the most amazing periods in the world's history. Gradually, however, these influences began to be felt, as they were felt elsewhere; and it was inevitable that the South finally should fall into line. Her vast natural resources and initiative and energy enabled her to catch step eco-

nomically, commercially and industrially with her Northern neighbors. In a most astonishing way she has risen out of the wilderness of waste and poverty in which the Civil War left her; and between 1880 and 1927 has built for herself a territory that offers all that is to be desired materially by the modern man.

Within her borders are climates unexcelled and scenery that matches Switzerland's in beauty. According to one's tastes one can find in the Southland health-giving mountains, great stretches of fine sea beaches, beautiful river valleys, rolling hills and plains that beckon to the travelers of the world. Beneath these varying terrains are to be found resources whose value is enough to maintain the Nation for centuries without the aid of other sections of the Union. Added to these she is able to offer all the mechanical comforts and pleasures that any other portion of America can offer. Her economic growth has been colossal; her industrial expansion has been amazing; but with it all she is static politically, and until recently has been woefully backward culturally; and now let us examine the reasons why.

The Solid South, as it is constituted to-day, is composed of South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina and Tennessee, in the order in which they seceded from the Union. At the outbreak of the conflict Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri were slaveholding states, but they did not secede. In 1863 the western counties of Virginia decided that they would cast their lot with the Federal Government and formed the State

of West Virginia. Since the war, however, West Virginia, Kentucky and Maryland have considered themselves as a part of what is known as the South, while Delaware has allowed herself to be rated as a Northern state, and Missouri looks upon herself as a Middle Western Commonwealth.

The Solid South was born of a struggle that began with the colonization of America early in the seventeenth century, a struggle between the South and New England, which passed through various forms. First it was economic rivalry; then it was political rivalry; and finally it grew into bitter differences over the question of social reform. One led inevitably to the other, and all were interwoven. Virginia and New England were settled by the same kind of stock,—the English,—within thirteen years of each other; and from the year 1640 down to the outbreak of the Civil War intense rivalries and jealousies were manifested. There arose differences in principles of politics; there were differences in climate and soil, differences in social conditions and in the general circumstances of the people; and these differences became wider and wider until when the anti-slavery movement was at its height, it required but little urging on the part of the radical abolitionists to precipitate warfare. The real frontier between the North and South from 1640 until the outbreak of the war was between Massachusetts and Virginia. These two States became vigorous rivals in the fields of politics and culture. It was Massachusetts that broke up what was known as the "Virginia dynasty," the period of presidents, and it was Massachu-

setts that sent the first Union troops against the Southerners. From the close of the War of 1812 until 1860 she held a distinguished place in national life and politics; so it was natural that she should be foremost in the struggle against slavery. Upon Massachusetts, particularly the radical abolitionists in her borders, and upon South Carolina, under the leadership of John C. Calhoun, must be placed the responsibility of the Civil War.

The underlying causes of the Civil War were the doctrine of State sovereignty and slavery; but slavery was the occasion rather than the actual cause of the conflict. The slavery struggle,—that is, the serious anti-slavery movement,—covered a period of twenty-eight years, from 1849 to 1877. The period from 1849 to 1861 marked the quarrel between the North and South over the question, in which the radical abolitionists played the leading part; and from 1861 to 1877 were the periods of the Civil War and Reconstruction.

But the issue of State sovereignty, and the right to secede, went back to the American Revolution itself; and both Northern and Southern leaders, at different times, supported it. There are a number of examples of the support of State sovereignty in Europe. In the year 1309 the Swiss cantons withdrew from the Empire and formed a Confederacy, from which, in 1843-1847, the Catholic cantons seceded and formed a new confederacy called the Sonderbund, which was crushed in the war that followed. In 1523 Sweden seceded from the Kalmarian formed in 1397 of Denmark, Sweden and Norway; and in 1814 Norway seceded and entered into a Union with Sweden,

from which, in the same year, it attempted to secede, but was forcibly prevented. Norway, however, accomplished a peaceful secession from the Union in 1905 and resumed her independent status. In 1848 and 1849 Hungary attempted to withdraw from the Union with Austria, but the attempt was defeated. Prussia and other north German states withdrew in 1866-1868 from the German Confederation and formed a new one. The instance of a successful secession is that of Panama, which seceded from the Republic of Colombia in 1905.

In the days following the American Revolution the colonies held that each State became sovereign by virtue of its successful revolution against England. Under the Crown there had been no political connection between the colonies; and the treaty of 1783 recognized them as "free sovereign and independent states." The Articles of Confederation recognized this sovereignty; and the theory of State sovereignty was maintained in the convention that framed the Federal Constitution in 1787.

Threats of secession were made by leaders in New England as far back as 1790, and again prior to and during the War of 1812. Secession was generally looked upon as the most potent remedy for Federal aggression; and notable expressions of State sovereignty were those contained in the famous Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, which Jefferson is said to have drafted; in the Hartford Convention of 1814; and in the South Carolina nullification ordinance of 1832. Jefferson condemned what he termed "scission," but some of his writings, although they

often reveal contradictions and paradoxes, admit that secession is a remedy of last resort.

With this political theory rooted in the minds of Southern leaders it was not surprising that the agitation against slavery prompted the Southern states to look upon secession as their right and destiny. The greatest single force, however, which led the South into this line of reasoning was John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina. Born of Scotch-Irish descent in 1782, Calhoun formed one of the famous triumvirate—himself, Webster and Clay. He was not the orator that Webster was and he did not possess Clay's magnetism; but he surpassed both men in boldness and in the vigor with which he reached political conclusions and adhered to them. At different times he was vice-president, cabinet officer and Senator; and from 1832 until his death in 1850, he devoted his life to what he believed was the protection of Southern interests.

Calhoun not only preached State sovereignty, but secession as well. Both political ideas had been advanced years before he was born; but it remained for the South Carolinian to voice them analytically and logically to such a degree that his influence, long after his death, gave South Carolina the assurance that she needed when she plunged the Nation into war. In 1832 South Carolina, at Calhoun's instigation, "nullified" the tariff acts passed by Congress in 1828 and 1832. President Andrew Jackson is pictured by historians as having taken drastic steps to rebuke her and if necessary hold her physically in subjection; but the truth is that it was Calhoun who won the day by offering a resolution in the Senate which

brought about the enactment of a compromise tariff act which satisfied South Carolina and she withdrew her nullification ordinance. Only the gods themselves know what would have been the result if the compromise had not been passed and if Jackson had persisted in his action against the State. It is not unreasonable to believe that with the sympathy other Southern states had for South Carolina's doctrine at the time, the Civil War would have come in 1832 instead of in 1861. In any event, if the South had won the war which finally came, Calhoun would have been to her people what St. Patrick is to the Irish.

In considering the Calhoun or—as it proved to be—the South Carolina school of political philosophy, it should be remembered that in the matter of State sovereignty, the wish was the father to the idea, in that the maintenance of State sovereignty meant the maintenance of slavery. While sovereignty did not depend upon slavery, slavery certainly depended upon sovereignty, so the philosophy was a selfish one with South Carolina. Calhoun's contention that the separate States were sovereign before and after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, that the Union was purely voluntary, and that the whole people, or the people of other States, had no right to maintain or enforce the Union against any State, was overruled irrevocably by the result of the Civil War. It is noteworthy, however, that States and political parties to-day are undecided as to the exact location of sovereignty; although the general belief seems to incline to Madison's view that the States were sovereign before the adoption

of the Constitution, and that they gave up a part of their sovereignty to the Federal Government. Supreme Court decisions under Chief Justice Marshall and under later chief justices have sustained this view; but the so-called centralization of power in Washington, at every session of Congress and with each succeeding election campaign, brings up anew the question of State sovereignty, or State's rights, as it sometimes is called.

South Carolina early asserted her sovereignty. At the convention in Philadelphia in 1787, when the Constitution was drafted, the sentiments of the framers, including notably Mr. Jefferson, were against slavery; but South Carolina and Georgia refused to join the Union unless slavery was recognized. It was the persistency of South Carolina, indeed, that prompted an agreement for the mutual arrest and return of fugitive slaves. So strongly opposed to any unfavorable action in so far as slavery was concerned was South Carolina, that the best that the Convention could do was to provide for a cessation of the slave trade after twenty years. Those persons who have observed how the modern bootlegger plies his trade and how illicit liquor is smuggled into the States, will realize how much this provision served to reduce the seriousness of the slavery issue. Instead, when the slave trade had been interdicted, after the twenty-year period, the slaveholding commonwealths were all the more determined to maintain slavery, and the abolitionists were equally as determined to oppose it.

South Carolina unquestionably was the hoyden State of the South. At three different times she would have

seceded from the Union. First in 1787; again in 1832, under Calhoun's leadership; and again in 1850, if the famous Compromise measures of that year had not been passed at the instigation of Webster and Clay. Apparently she was as bent on seceding from the Union at some time as women nowadays are bent on getting divorces when they find they have married disadvantageously. The State early in the seventeenth century had been settled by a strange mixture of people—the English, the Scotch-Irish and the French Protestants. Intermarriages brought into being a race that second to none—not even the fiery Georgia crackers—is the hottest tempered of all the folk in the Southland.

This being true, it is not surprising that the abolitionists, many of whom were well-meaning reformers, with a flair for humanitarianism which carried them beyond the bounds of truth and decency, had little difficulty in driving South Carolina to precipitate the bloody conflict which tore the heart of the Union for four long years.

It is interesting to review briefly the election campaign of 1860 and Mr. Lincoln's utterances immediately following his election, and see what a flimsy excuse South Carolina had when Governor W. H. Gist of that State in 1860 sent his famous letter to the governors of other Cotton States, asking coöperation in the event South Carolina should decide to secede. Lincoln's platform in 1860 demanded the exclusion of slavery in the territories. The slaveholding States were no more affected by such a pronouncement than they were in 1787. Slave trading a half century before had been outlawed, so the question

of bringing more slaves into the slave States, or driving them out of the slave States, was not an issue. But this was the South's fear—or apparently South Carolina's fear: the free territories and the free States were becoming greater in number than the slave States, and the balance of power politically and economically was growing against the South. So in finally judging South Carolina's action it can be truthfully said that she had no plausible reason for seceding in so far as Mr. Lincoln's election and his attitude toward slavery were concerned.

In his first inaugural address, President Lincoln strove earnestly to allay the fears of the South, and quoted from a campaign speech he had made the year before, in which he said among other things, "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." This should have been convincing, but—

The abolitionists—William Lloyd Garrison, Elijah Lovejoy, Wendell Phillips, Charles Sumner and John Brown, not to mention Harriet Beecher Stowe, had inflamed the minds of the Northerners with stories of cruelties and atrocities perpetrated on the slaves by their owners. To their hymns of hate were added the chorics of Bryant, Longfellow, Whittier and Whitman, while essayists like William E. Channing and R. W. Emerson encouraged their deadly work. So South Carolina assumed the right to believe that in spite of what Lincoln said the abolitionists, sooner or later, would force the Southern States to give up their slaves. It would appear now that

State sovereignty had faded into obscurity; and so it had, for although there were many varying forces accumulating through the years to bring on the Civil War, it was slavery and nothing else that prompted South Carolina to plunge her sister States into the conflict. Those States which followed, I believe, went into the war in the belief that they must uphold the doctrine of State sovereignty—but not South Carolina. In Virginia where an intelligent political and social leadership had been maintained since early colonial days, all, or nearly all her leaders, soldiers and statesmen alike, had opposed slavery, at one time or another. Washington was against it; Jefferson tried to put an end to it in his State and in the Nation; and “Stonewall” Jackson and Robert E. Lee, two of the world’s greatest soldiers and noblest of men, opposed slavery. In a letter written from Texas, to a relative in Virginia, dated December 27, 1856, Lee declared:

“There are few, I believe, in this enlightened age who will not acknowledge that slavery as an institution is a moral and political evil. It is idle to expatiate on its disadvantages. I think it is a greater evil to the white than to the colored race. While my feelings are strongly enlisted in behalf of the latter, my sympathies are more deeply engaged for the former. The blacks are immeasurably better off here than in Africa, morally, physically, and socially. . . . How long their servitude may be necessary is known and ordered by a merciful Providence. Their emancipation will sooner result from the mild and melting influences of Christianity than from the storm and tempest of fiery controversy. . . . While we see the course of the final abolition of human slavery is

still onward, and give it our prayers, let us leave the progress as well as the results in the hand of Him who sees the end, who chooses to work by slow influences, and with whom a thousand years are but a single day. Although the abolitionist must know this—must know that he had neither the right nor the power of operating, except by moral means; that to benefit the slave he must not excite angry feelings in the master; that, although he may not approve the mode by which Providence accomplishes its purpose, the results will be the same; and that the reasons he gives for interference in matters he has no concern with, holds good for every kind of interference with his neighbor—still, I fear he will persevere in his evil course.”

Here we have what should have been the South’s spiritual platform, and its political platform as well. But South Carolina did not see it that way. And no altruistic motive was hers when she seceded. Her motive plainly was, as I have indicated, an altogether selfish one—the maintenance of the institution of slavery; and the blood of the Civil War is on her head as much as it is on the heads of the abolitionists. Calhoun’s influence had taken root, so it was natural that even so noble a man as Robert E. Lee left the Union which had made him a soldier, and offered his sword to his State in what had become the South’s abiding belief in the doctrine of State sovereignty. Lee’s attitude typified the loftier, but mistaken conception of the South. Forty-five years after the war ended, Capt. Robert E. Lee, the Confederate chieftain’s grandson, in an address before a State convention of Confederate veterans in the city of Roanoke, Virginia,

declared, "We did not fight for what we thought was right; we fought for what we *knew* was right." And so many in the Solid South believe to this day.

Meanwhile, what of Lincoln? His conciliatory words in the first inaugural address,¹ had been taken seriously by the anti-secessionists in the South. They believed he meant what he said; but time brings many changes, and Lincoln's attitude toward slavery went through a radical change in two years. In September, 1863, he issued his famous Emancipation Proclamation, freeing all the slaves in the rebellious States. How could he consistently do this in view of his avowed intention in his first inaugural not to interfere "directly or indirectly with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists"? The answer is that he was guided by military exigencies, and not by humanitarian motives. The collapse of McClellan's Richmond campaign, according to Nicolay and Hay in their "Life of Lincoln," prompted him to consider measures which ultimately materialized in the Emancipation Proclamation.¹ The Emancipation was not prompted by the noble sentiments which the abolitionists, in later years, attributed to Lincoln, and which the Negroes in America have since been led to believe. As Nicolay and Hay, his authoritative biographers, say, "We are justified in the inference that his foresight had perceived and estimated the great and decisive element of the strength which lay as yet untouched and unappropriated in the slave population of the South."² The wording of the proclamation is unmis-

¹ Page 120, Vol. 6, Nicolay and Hay's "Life."

² *Ibid.*

takable. He freed the slaves in the South "as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion"; and he justified himself by saying that it was "upon military necessity" that he invoked the "considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of God."

A Southern orator some years ago, speaking of the men of the war period, exclaimed, "There were giants in those days!" Well might he have said there were misguided men in those days; for it is certain, in the light of history as we are enabled to review it at this distance, that South Carolina could have prevented the Civil War, in the first place, and that Lincoln probably could have prevented it if he had been wiser, and even if he could not have prevented it, he could have lived up to the economic and political philosophy laid down in his first inaugural and have let the South solve her slavery problem as Lee suggested. There were giants in those days; but giants who had a clumsy way of doing things. And yet, if they had not existed, there would be no Solid South as we know that section to-day.

CHAPTER II

CONFLICT

At the time of Lincoln's election in 1860, South Carolina was the third State in the Union in wealth in proportion to her population. Her assessed value of property was \$489,000,000, while the combined values of Rhode Island and New Jersey, two of the North's leading manufacturing States, were \$421,000,000, giving South Carolina a lead of \$68,000,000. As was stated in the preceding chapter her motive for seceding from the Union was a selfish one or—to use a milder term—an economic one. She had three main considerations: the Negro as property, the Negro as a form of labor, and cotton.

Lincoln was elected in November and could not assume office until the following March. Events between election day and inauguration day occupied the attention of the Nation. Determined to secede, the South Carolina Legislature called a State convention which on December 20 unanimously passed an "ordinance of secession," repealing the acts by which the State had ratified the Constitution and its amendments, and dissolving the "union now subsisting between South Carolina and other States, under the name of the 'United States of America.'" Steps were taken to prepare for a conflict and the convention adjourned. Lincoln in his home in Springfield now knew that he faced the gravest problem that had ever con-

fronted an American President-elect. But South Carolina's secession was not yet Lincoln's problem. It was President Buchanan's. A man of unquestioned honesty and of the highest patriotism, Buchanan did all that any human being could have done in the circumstances, to prevent a collision.

In his annual message to Congress of December, 1860, he argued that a State had no legal right to secede, but denied that the Federal Government had any power forcibly to prevent it. The same logic is advanced to this day in connection with decrees of the United States Supreme Court. It is held that such decrees cannot be enforced by the Court; and its decrees can be carried out only by what amounts to moral suasion. Buchanan continued, until the day he relinquished the Presidency, to work for peace. He supported the famous Crittenden Compromise which recognized the right of new States to determine the question of slavery themselves and prohibited Congress from abolishing the interstate slave trade through the exercise of its commerce powers. This might have prevented the war had it been adopted but it was defeated in a Congressional committee, by the abolitionist members. Then followed another effort to maintain peace by means of the Peace Conference in February, 1861. Delegates from the Northern and Border States met in Washington, upon the call of the State of Virginia, and proposed Constitutional amendments similar to those proposed in the Crittenden Compromise. None of the far Southern States sent delegates to the conference, however, and nothing came of it, although Buchanan

gave it his warmest support. He disapproved of any military gesture of any kind on the part of the Government at this time, and was particularly opposed to Major Anderson's famous removal of troops from Fort Moultrie to Fort Sumter in December, 1860. Buchanan, of course, knew that South Carolina was waiting like an angry cat to spring at the Government's throat. After the February Peace Conference, the month which would bring Lincoln into the White House, dragged on. Congress did little or nothing except to admit Kansas as a free State and adopt the Morrill tariff law. A tariff law had been enacted in 1857 enlarging the free trade list and lowering the average duty to about 20 per cent. The Morrill Act increased the tariff of 1857 about one-third. This did not serve to create a better feeling in South Carolina where the tariff issue had been almost as bitterly fought as the slavery issue.

Abraham Lincoln entered upon the duties of the Presidency on March 4, 1861, facing the greatest crisis that had ever risen in the Nation, surpassing in potentialities the American Revolution and all the conflicts that followed. He was untried, and little known by the members of the Republican party in the North. In 1856 and in the pre-convention campaign of 1860 the North had accepted William H. Seward as the recognized leader of the new party. Lincoln wisely made Seward his Secretary of State, and the North naturally expected Seward to be the leader and the brains of the Administration during the national crisis. A college trained man, a man of culture and wide experience in statecraft, Seward had some

right for believing as much himself. But later events proved that Lincoln's personality and leadership were to eclipse those of all the members of his cabinet. Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, ambitious and temperamental, was Secretary of the Treasury; Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, a man whom later events proved, possessed questionable integrity, was Secretary of War for one year before the famous and pugnacious Edwin M. Stanton took over that portfolio; Gideon Welles, of Connecticut, who although not a technically trained man, was one of Lincoln's most efficient cabinet members and handled with great skill the most difficult problems of the war, was Secretary of the Navy; Edward Bates, of Missouri, a man of little fame and consequence, was Attorney General; Montgomery Blair, of Maryland, the first Federal official to establish the free city delivery, the money order system and the use of railway mail cars, was Postmaster General; and Caleb B. Smith, of Indiana, a man of little or no prominence, was Secretary of the Interior.

When the Lincoln Administration went into power, six more States had seceded from the Union. Following South Carolina's example, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia and Louisiana had seceded during the month of January, and Texas followed in February. The other Southern States were biding their time. Virginia, particularly, was trying to maintain peace. In the election of 1860 Virginia had returned a majority of Unionist electors against the secessionist candidates, Breckinridge and Lane. Many of her large plantation owners voted for the continuance of the Union, while the small slave-own-

ers supported secession. Her best minds were staunch Unionists and predominated in the extra session of the Legislature called by Governor Wise in February, 1861. It was not until after Sumter had been fired upon and the Government at Washington had called upon the State to supply its quota of armed men to suppress the "insurrection" in the other Southern States, that Virginia seceded. Her motive for secession was purely one of the maintenance of State sovereignty.

From March 4 until April 14, Lincoln and his cabinet were occupied with two great problems: How to maintain peace between the North and South and how to prepare for war in the event there was to be a conflict. He had warned the South of the determination of the Government to defend its authority, and to hold forts and places yet in its possession; but he declared his intention not to invade, subjugate or oppress the seceding States. "You can have no conflict," he said, "without being yourself the aggressors." But seven States were out of the Union, and the theory that the Government could still hold its forts and other properties within their borders, was one with which the seceded States did not agree.

There now came a time when the statesmanship of Lincoln and Seward were to be contrasted; and an event, which has been given little attention in the histories of the Civil War, is one of the most interesting incidents in Lincoln's official career. Determined to maintain peace, almost to the point of desperation, Lincoln, late in March, 1861, addressed informal memorandums to each member of his cabinet, asking them to state their opinion on

how the crisis confronting the Government could best be handled. There were varying opinions; but of all the idiotic proposals that have ever come from the pen of an American statesman, Seward's was the rarest. On April 1,—a date to conjure with in view of his ridiculous plan,—Seward in a memorandum to Lincoln proposed that America precipitate a world war to save the Union! He suggested a conflict in which America was to oppose most of Europe, with himself as director of the enterprise. The conduct of Spain toward Santo Domingo, and France toward Mexico, and the alleged attitude of England and Russia toward the seceded States were to be the grounds for precipitating this gigantic conflict. American agents were to be sent into Canada, Mexico and Central America to arouse hostility against Europe.

There is no evidence that Lincoln replied to Seward's proposal. Silence was certainly the best answer he could have given to a scheme which had the earmarks of the dream of an opium eater. Even if a world war could have been precipitated, it was now too late. The Union already was divided; and all that remained to be done was South Carolina's hot-headed act—the bombardment and capture of Fort Sumter on April 14, 1861.

The hand of Fate had written the Nation's destiny. Lincoln's call for volunteers was the signal for the secession in turn of Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina and Tennessee. By June 8, 1861, when the last named State had seceded, the Solid South had come into being and was destined to survive a great conflict and the desperate days

of reconstruction, and to become the most provincial of the four great sections of the present Union.

When the Civil War began the South had a population of approximately 12,000,000 persons, of whom 4,000,000 were slaves. In the North there were about 19,000,000 inhabitants. There were in the United States at the time about 4,000,000 foreign born, the majority of whom had emigrated to America since 1840. Irish peasants, numbering about 780,000 arrived in the first decade, followed by more than 900,000 in the next. Political disturbances and economic difficulties had led 1,386,000 Germans to migrate to this country between 1840 and 1860. These immigrants went to the Northern States, particularly to the factory towns of New England, to the mines and foundries of Pennsylvania, and into the new West and Northwest in search of Government land.

On the other hand, the only foreign element the South had were Africans. In the ten years preceding the Civil War slave-traders were so bold that they smuggled shiploads of slaves through the secluded bayous of the Gulf Coast and Florida, and through the port of Mobile. It has been estimated that between 1808, the year when slave-trading was interdicted in America, and 1860, approximately 270,000 slaves were smuggled into the United States.

The North strengthened by first-rate labor and excellent man-power, between 1840 and 1860 had outstripped the South economically. While the wealth of the North, represented in farms, factories, shipping and railroads, was more evenly divided among a more numerous popu-

lation, the planters of the South, because of their well-nigh valueless slave labor and their dependence upon a single crop,—cotton,—steadily were becoming impoverished, and were in a backward state, when the war broke out. A contrast in how the agriculturists in the North and South operated is an excellent example of the differences between the two sections. Tillage by slave labor was crude. The slaves, as a rule, were so untrustworthy and ignorant that they could not handle the modern farm machinery of the day. A cheap wooden plow, drawn by a mule or an ox, a hoe, and a broadax were the only implements with which they could be trusted. The North had better machinery and better labor. In 1860 the average value per acre of land in the South was forty-two cents, while in the North it was ninety-four.

The taxable property of the South, according to the census of 1860, was estimated at \$5,000,000,000, of which \$2,000,000,000 represented slaves and \$1,500,000,000 real estate, devoted mainly to the growing of cotton. Northern property approximated \$11,000,000,000, and consisted chiefly of manufacturing, mining and commercial plants whose outputs easily could be converted into implements of war.

The first Confederate States came into being at Montgomery, Alabama, on February 8, 1861, when delegates from the States which had seceded up to that time formed a provisional constitution, chose Jefferson Davis and A. H. Stephens, provisional president and vice-president respectively, and established an army, treasury and other governmental departments. It is interesting to note here

that the constitution, which was adopted on March 11, contained the Southern credo, which unto this day in some measure, is looked upon by many Southerners as the fundamental principles upon which the Solid South is founded. The constitution, in the main, was patterned after the Federal organic law; but its chief differences from the Federal document lay in its maintenance of State sovereignty, provision for cabinet seats in Congress, the prevention of "bounties" or any protective features in tariff; and it expressly provided that in all the territory belonging to the Confederacy, but lying without the limits of the several States, "the institution of Negro slavery, as it now exists in the Confederate States, shall be recognized and protected by Congress and by the Territorial Government." Nothing could have been more revolutionary and defiant than this document; and probably nothing could have more inflamed the North into a determination to defeat the South's purposes.

After Lincoln's call for volunteers, and after Virginia and Arkansas had seceded in April and May respectively, the Provisional Government of the Confederacy established its permanent capital at Richmond, Virginia, by an act passed May 8. The Virginia capital's importance was due to its nearness to Washington, the material and manufacturing resources concentrated in it, and to the moral effect that the establishment of the capital there would have on the South generally because of Virginia's long leadership in the nation's political and military life. From then on Virginia proved to be the battleground of the Civil War and suffered more damage to property at

the hands of the Northern forces than any other State in the South. It was on her soil that the first Manassas campaign was prosecuted; the Peninsula battles were fought within her borders; she bore the brunt of the second Manassas and the bloody battles of Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville and the great Wilderness-Petersburg engagements. About 50,000 men were killed and 100,000 died of wounds and disease in Virginia alone.

When by June 8, North Carolina and Tennessee had joined their lot with the other seceded States, the Confederacy, composed of eleven commonwealths, was prepared to go through with the war in earnest. But wars cannot be fought with courage alone. Fighting men must be clothed and rationed and equipped; and the biggest problem that lay before the Confederate Government was the financing of the conflict.

Leaders of the South had every right to expect that much of their expenses could be met through its custom revenue, but the Federal navy's successful blockade stopped the South's trade with foreign countries, so some other method of raising funds had to be used. First the individual States were directed to levy a direct property tax of one-half of one per cent. and to turn over the proceeds to the Confederate treasury. But only \$18,000,000 was raised by this tax, and many of the taxpayers made their payments in State bonds of questionable value. The only thing that was left to be done was to issue bonds, and this was done to the tune of \$15,000,000 at 8 per cent. interest, secured by an export tax on cotton of one-eighth of a cent a pound. Southern bankers, particularly in New

Orleans and Charleston, took up this issue, and placed all the available specie in the Confederate treasury. The money immediately was used abroad for military supplies.

A bond issue of \$150,000,000 in 1862 was made payable in produce. As a result of this loan the Confederate Government came into possession of quantities of cotton, tobacco, wheat, rice, sugar and molasses, together with \$1,000,000 in paper currency. The commodities were nothing more than a drug on the market. A foreign loan of \$150,000,000 was negotiated in 1863, the bonds being made redeemable in cotton, and since cotton was selling at famine prices in England and the Continent, these securities sold without difficulty. But those Englishmen who purchased Russian bonds prior to the revolution of 1917 will know how their fathers and grandfathers must have desired to kick themselves where it would do the most good for having accepted these famous Confederate bonds.

Confederate leaders, in spite of their desperate financial plans, soon learned that but a fraction of the South's military expenditures could be met by these bond issues. Then began the career of the Confederate dollar whose pathetic history to-day is known throughout the world. When the Confederacy resorted to credit money, what with all the other unfavorable economic forces that had oppressed it, it might have known that it was waging a losing fight in the face of a successful blockade which the North had effected and in the face of a far greater manpower.

Treasury notes, redeemable within the year and bearing

interest at 3.65 per cent., were issued in March, 1861. On an issue of April, 1862, the rate was raised to 7.3 per cent. Notes, offering no interest and not redeemable till "six months after the ratification of a peace treaty," were ordered at the same time. This currency was made receivable for taxes, but the Confederacy refrained from declaring it legal tender in payment of private debts.

The issues of 1861 amounted to \$30,000,000; and by December, 1862, \$450,000,000 had been circulated. In 1863 \$150,000,000 was issued; and approximately the same amount was issued respectively for the last two years of the war. The total sum of all issues of Confederate currency approximated a billion dollars. To this gigantic sum must be added issues made by State governments, banks and private business firms.

Is it necessary to detail, as most historians have done, the battles of the Civil War in the face of this inevitable journey toward bankruptcy? Suffice it to say of the military operations that the Northern troops first were repelled in their invasion of Virginia. The Story of Bull Run is a familiar one. Reviewing the military operations briefly, it is sufficient for the purposes of this volume to say that after the first success in Virginia the Confederate forces slowly were forced back in the West, where the fall of Vicksburg marked their final fate. At the same time Lee's defeat at Gettysburg crushed the hopes of the Southerners in the East. After these two events, the moving finger of fate was writing the story of a hopeless struggle against the persistent and successful campaigns of Grant and Sherman.

But, as heroic as the Southerners were,—and there is no denying that generally they were far better and more resourceful fighters than the Northerners,—how could an invaded South, blockaded on all sides and buried up to its neck in an enormous unredeemable currency issue, hope to meet with success? The depreciation of the currency issues enumerated above, followed almost as soon as they were put out. This was due to two important causes: inflation and the lack of confidence in their redemption. In January, 1863, a gold dollar was worth three dollars in Confederate paper. Twelve months later gold exchanged for twenty-one dollars. And in January, 1865, it required fifty-three Confederate dollars to buy a gold dollar. The Confederate dollar passed out of circulation early in April, after the fall of Richmond. These famous Confederate dollars were lost or destroyed or placed in old attic trunks; and if you cast your eyes upon one in a museum to-day you will be looking upon a factor which probably as potently as Grant or Sherman, aided Mr. Lincoln in subduing the hot-headed Southerners.

At Appomattox Court House on April 9, 1865, General Lee surrendered to General Grant; and within a few weeks the Confederacy was at an end. In all the annals of the wars of the world there is no more gallant conqueror than General Grant on that April day. Considerate of Lee throughout the whole procedure, he did the one kindly thing, in making his terms of surrender, that gave the South a fighting chance to recover from the waste and destruction and despair that awaited the return of her soldiers from the battlefields. The Confederate

officers were permitted to sign paroles for themselves and their men; and each soldier of the Southern army who owned a horse or mule was permitted to retain it for farming purposes. The Southern officers were permitted to retain their side-arms and private horses and baggage. Grant divined the struggle that lay before the impoverished South, and nobly he aided his former foes in the only way that he could possibly have done, in beginning their long and heartrending labor of rehabilitation.

The total number of enlistments in the Union army was 2,688,523. The number of enlistments in the Confederate army was between 650,000 and 700,000. Approximately 300,000 men were killed on each side. It is difficult to determine the exact cost of the war, but the best sources available place the cost at \$3,250,000,000 for the North and \$1,500,000,000 for the South; but these figures do not include the incalculable property loss suffered by the people of the South, including war damage and the freeing of their slaves who had a property value.

The soldiers of the Confederacy once more took up their lives where they had left off in 1861. The work of rebuilding their homeland was a desperate task; but during the more than three-score years since the close of the war they have built a monument industrially and economically that probably has no parallel in the world. With all their achievement, though, the South continues to find authority from the Central Government irksome. In a letter dated August 24, 1865, General Lee, while president of Washington College, wrote the trustees of that institution, in part as follows:

"I think it the duty of every citizen, in the present condition of the country, to do all in his power to aid in the restoration of peace and harmony, and in no way to oppose the policy of the State or General Government directed to that object. It is particularly incumbent on those charged with the instruction of the young to set them an example of submission to authority . . ."

The young men of the South learned to maintain a measure of peace and harmony; but submission to authority does not include the recognition of what they consider "those two damnable amendments," the Fourteenth and Fifteenth; and this, as has been said, is one of the reasons why we still have the Solid South with us to-day.

CHAPTER III

RECONSTRUCTION

If you go into the States of North and South Carolina and Georgia, and particularly into South Carolina to-day, and mention the name of General William Tecumseh Sherman, it would be well for you to seek cover first, and then if escape is not blocked, leave the section immediately for the North. For Sherman is to this section the incarnation of all the hated qualities of the "damned Yankee." In his famous march from Chattanooga to Atlanta, which city he captured, thence to the sea at Savannah and back northward through the Carolinas, all that he left the people in this area was damage and despair and a hate that has not died to this day. Railways were destroyed, homes were burned, slaves were herded away, supplies were taken, and the section was swept as bare as if a gigantic broom had been used by a Titan. On the morning of the 17th of February, General Sherman and his army entered the city of Columbia, South Carolina, on his return northward. That night a fire broke out and destroyed most of the city, including church buildings, business houses and homes. Sherman and his officers denied that they had anything to do with it, but to this day it is the belief in South Carolina that the hated Sherman ordered the town to be fired. And the people of Charleston have not forgotten how, on the same day,

they were compelled to flee the city after burning nearly all their cotton and supplies.

It is but human for the people in the Carolinas and Georgia to be bitter over the treatment they received from Sherman; but their experiences were no worse in many ways than the experiences of the Southerners in the Shenandoah valley, in Eastern Virginia, and in the Mississippi valley. In Virginia, particularly, and in other portions of the South, towns were burned, bridges were wrecked, railroad tracks were torn up and plantations were so deprived of their assets that they fell into ruin. Cotton, the only marketable commodity the South had, had been used for breastworks, or was confiscated or rendered unsalable. Wealthy business men and plantation owners were impoverished by the collapse of Confederate currency and bonds; the poorer classes of people were thrown into a state of destitution that was tragic and heartrending.

One-third of the adult males of the white population had fallen in battle or returned home incapacitated for work. Land had depreciated to half its ante-bellum value, and the capital needed to rebuild on the ashes of ruin was as absent as were joy and hope in Southern hearts. On top of all this ruin Lincoln had hurled upon the backs of the South 4,000,000 free Negroes; and the world's history has no record of greater suffering than was theirs for the first three or four years after the close of the war. They suffered for want of food, clothing and shelter, and thousands of them died of hunger and disease. The Freedmen's Bureau, established by the Federal War Department, did much to help the former slaves

to become self-supporting, furnished them with supplies, protected them against fraud at the hands of unscrupulous white men, and would have done a great deal more if local officials of the bureau had not been lacking in tact, something which caused the enmity of the Southern white men. The operations of the bureau ceased in 1870. But, even with the work of the bureau, the problem of the emancipated blacks became essentially the problem of the South, because they had now become a part of the South's citizenry. And more than three-score years after the close of the war, they are still the South's chief problem, of which more will be said later.

When the war had ended, the South was in the hands of her conquerors; and the chief problem of the Federal Government was the establishment of civil governments and the restoration of suspended Federal relations in the States which had seceded. The War Department, vigorously urged on by the radical abolitionists, naturally wanted military control maintained. But political-minded leaders in the North knew that such a policy meant the ignoring of the Southern States as States, which would have been inconsistent with the avowed purposes of the war, from the Federal standpoint, as Mr. Lincoln had enunciated them. He had declared that secession was unlawful and that the object of the war was to maintain the Union and hold the seceded States therein. The war, in so far as the South was concerned, in his opinion, was a "rebellion of individuals."

The problem of reconstruction was a Federal responsibility; but this responsibility was distasteful, and so in

accordance with Mr. Lincoln's plans, which later were followed by President Johnson, a program of "self-reconstruction" was to be carried out. This followed the philosophy of the illegality of secession; and it was reasoned that because the States were unaffected by their secession, they should resume their normal functions in the Union as soon as their loyal inhabitants were able, under Federal protection, to control their governments. But programs on paper look much easier than putting them into practice proves to be; and from the year 1865 to 1880 was a stormy period in the history of the South. This was due, perhaps, to the well-nigh impossibility of carrying out the full programs of Lincoln and Johnson.

Lincoln, like Jefferson, was a great believer in the people. "The people," he said, "are the rightful masters of both congresses and courts, not to overthrow the constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the constitution." In these words is a glimpse of what would have been Lincoln's attitude toward the South in Reconstruction days had he lived. No man can divine "what might have been." But when an assassin's bullet ended Mr. Lincoln's life, Southern men and women groaned with real grief. In some sections of the South they were almost panic-stricken, because, in spite of Lincoln's attack on slavery and in spite of his dogged prosecution of the war, they instinctively felt that once the war was over he would give them fair treatment. In some parts of the South to-day, particularly in South Carolina, where Confederate organizations keep alive their hatred for the "Yankees," Lincoln is still looked upon as an enemy. He is still

maligned; and the responsibility for all the South's woes is still laid upon him. But the intelligent people in the South sincerely believe that he would have been their friend, and that the days of Reconstruction would have been freer of suffering, had he lived.

Lincoln and Johnson both were natives of the South, one born in Kentucky and the other in North Carolina; but Lincoln's public career was identified with the Middle West, while Johnson's was identified with his native land. When he succeeded Lincoln to the Presidency, therefore, in the very nature of things, he couldn't demand the respect and confidence in the South that Lincoln would have demanded. By many Southerners he was looked upon as a "scalawag," a term applied to fellow Southerners who joined the Republican party or who aided or sympathized with the North during the war. Nevertheless, Johnson strove sincerely and earnestly to carry out Lincoln's policy as he believed Lincoln would have desired, and he favored the South in many ways. This, of course, drew the enmity of the Northern leaders, and he was made to pay for his course with a great deal of mental anguish which his impeachment trial created.

Holding to the "self-reconstruction" program, Johnson, in the summer of 1865, set up provisional governments in all the seceded States except Texas, and within a few months all those States were reorganized and applying for readmission to the Union. Meanwhile the Federal Congress was Republican by a large majority, and the radical members vigorously opposed Johnson. Their

opposition was due to the fear that, once readmitted, the Democratic membership in Congress would be strengthened; to the belief that the Southerners had not been sufficiently punished for their rebellion, and to the fact that the South was bent upon not giving political rights to the Negroes. Serious trouble followed, and the Negro issue was the cause of it.

Johnson was opposed to a general suffrage, and he was particularly opposed to immediate suffrage; so a bitter contest between the President and Congress began in February, 1866, and continued until after his impeachment trial. Congress refused to admit representatives from the South, and during 1866 passed over Johnson's veto such measures as the Freedman's Bureau Act, the Civil Rights Act, and submitted to the States the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. The following year Congress, bent upon oppressing the South as much as a body of lawmakers could, jettisoned Johnson's whole reconstruction program, and adopted one of its own. The chief features of this were the disfranchisement of ex-Confederates and the enfranchisement of the Negroes; and now had come the time when the South, with economic woes sufficient to crush her, was to be further torn and made to suffer humiliation and reverses.

One thing which had driven Congress to such drastic action was the South's attitude toward the freed slaves. In their attempts, in 1865 and 1866, under the Lincoln-Johnson reconstruction program, to legislate for the freedmen, the Southern States recognized emancipation for the blacks, but it never occurred to them to recognize

the former slaves as citizens, with the rights of citizens. In nearly all the Southern States the Negroes under the Lincoln-Johnson program were given a subordinate civil status, they were subjected to restrictions in business and in contracts, and a system of penalties for vagrancy and minor offenses was provided, which practically established compulsory labor as the normal condition of the Negro. Such an attitude inflamed the radicals and abolitionists in Congress; and, already burdened with the feeling that the South had been let off too easily, the Federal lawmakers passed the measures above mentioned.

The purposes of the Freedmen's Bureau has been explained. The Civil Rights Act provided for the protection of "all persons in the United States in their civil rights," and for "furnishing the means of their vindication." The text was ominous. It was like waving a red flag in the face of the Southerners. In 1875 this Act was amended to prevent discriminations against Negroes in hotels, theaters, railway carriages and other utilities; but in several cases of discrimination brought by Negroes before the Supreme Court that tribunal, in 1883, ruled the clauses securing equal rights unconstitutional, since Congress, in spite of the Fourteenth Amendment, had not the right to regulate the private relations of citizens within the States. Upon the strength of this decision the South, for all practical purposes, during the past forty-four years, has defeated the chief aims and desires of the famous Reconstruction Congress. It has denied the Negro the full rights of citizenship and it has denied him his right of suffrage, as will be described more fully later.

In the Reconstruction Congress of 1867, there were two men who had more to do with producing the confusion and bloodshed that was to follow in the two decades after the Civil War, than any others. These were Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, in the Senate, and Thaddeus Stevens, a native of Vermont, but representing Pennsylvania in the House. Sumner had a stormy, colorful career in Congress. It was his speech in the Senate in August, 1852, on "Freedom National; Slavery Sectional," that first solidified the abolitionists in Congress against the South. The conventions of the Democratic party and the Whigs, a few months before, had approved the provisions of the series of measures known as the "Compromise of 1850." These bills, which were strongly sanctioned by Webster and Clay, were five in number. The first provided for the admission of California as a free State. The second provided for the organization of New Mexico and Utah as States, without slavery being mentioned. The third fixed the northern boundary of Texas, as it is now established, and provided that the sum of \$10,000,000 be paid to the State for relinquishing its claims to New Mexico. The fourth was the famous fugitive slave act, which provided that a master or his agent could take a supposed fugitive from the State in which he was residing without a jury trial in that State, and imposed fines on those who interfered with the capture or rendition of fugitive slaves. It compelled all citizens who were summoned to aid in the capture of fugitives to give their assistance, and provided that the fee received by United States marshals for Negroes who were

declared to be fugitives should be from \$5 to \$10. The fifth bill abolished the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

Sumner in a three-hour address demanded that the fugitive slave act be repealed, and denounced it as a violation of the Constitution, an affront to the public conscience, and an offense against the divine law. His words created a storm of anger among the Southern Congressmen, and produced a sensation in the North and South. Whether or not Sumner was influenced by Harriet Beecher Stowe's famous volume, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," is not known, but it is reasonable to believe he was. The book had made its first appearance on March 20, 1852, and immediately created a sensation. It had unexampled popularity in the North, was read by some Southerners, and was translated into at least twenty-three different languages. It was the culmination of the abolitionist movement which had begun in 1830, and was directed chiefly against the fugitive slave law, which was being openly and flagrantly violated in the North.

Perhaps Sumner saw the great influence which the book had wrought on the minds of the people in the North, and was encouraged thereby. In May, 1856, he made another address which was as sensational as the first. This time he denounced the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, which had been passed in 1854 and which provided that the two territories of Kansas and Nebraska be organized without any reference to whether they should be slave or free, and that the people residing in the territories should determine whether or not they wanted slavery. The result of

the act was the rapid settlement of the territory by abolitionists and by Missourians who favored slavery. The two factions entered into a struggle, and in 1856 what amounted to civil war broke out in which much property was destroyed and many lives were lost.

Sumner vigorously denounced what he termed the "Crime Against Kansas," and held up to scorn Stephen A. Douglas, Lincoln's old oratorical foe, and Andrew P. Butler, the authors of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, "as the Don Quixote and Sancho Panza of the harlot, slavery." Two days later, Preston P. Brooks, a congressman from South Carolina and a relative of Butler, in anger confronted Sumner as he sat at his desk in the Senate Chamber, denounced the speech as libelous and as an insult to his relative, and then proceeded to pinion Sumner to his desk and give him one of the worst beatings that has ever been administered by one statesman to another in the annals of the American Congress. Brooks's blows upon Sumner's head were so frequent and vigorous that finally he sank bleeding and unconscious to the floor. The attack almost cost Sumner his life; but after three years he returned to his post, and in 1859, with his same old fire, and in the face of the election campaign of 1860, he delivered an address on "The Barbarism of Slavery."

Sumner probably was the first outstanding Congressional reconstructionist in the North. He had no doubt as to the outcome of the war, and the conflict had hardly begun before he was advancing his theories of reconstruction. He held that the Southern States by their own act had "committed State suicide," and that their status

and the conditions of their readmission to the Union would be matters for Congress to decide. So it was not surprising that when the war had ended he vigorously opposed the reconstruction policies of Lincoln and Johnson which were based on the assumption that reconstruction measures lay within the powers of the executive.

Throughout the war Sumner had been the champion of the Negro, and always was a vigorous advocate of emancipation. As one reviews the period of the war from this distance, it is not difficult to see that he and Stevens more than any other men influenced Lincoln to issue his emancipation proclamation. And it is to Sumner and Stevens that the South must forever give thanks, or hold in perpetual calumny, as the case may be, for the establishment of equal suffrage rights for Negroes. Sumner has been described as a scholar in politics, a phrase that is lightly used nowadays in speaking of public men; but heedless of the world's many historical lessons, heedless of the proved fact that the Negro race was slower than any other in forming capacity for self-government, he insisted upon giving the ballot to the most ignorant of blacks, in the mistaken belief that their rights would be taken from them by their former masters and that the Northern aims of the conflict would be lost. It must be admitted that he also advocated free homesteads and free schools for the Negro which he hoped in time would fit them for suffrage, as it certainly has done, in some cases, but, by and large, the South since the close of the war has defeated the best dreams of Sumner.

It would be hard to say which exerted the more pow-

erful influence against the South in the Reconstruction Congress, Sumner or Thaddeus Stevens. Both were abolitionists. Both were violently Northern in their sentiments, and the leading enemies of the Lincoln-Johnson program. Stevens, a native of Vermont, remained in New England until he was a matured man. After his graduation from Dartmouth College in 1814 he removed to York, Pennsylvania, to practice law, and it was with that State that his political career was identified. As fate would have it, he spent his first fifteen years at Gettysburg, which was to be the scene of one of the bloodiest battles of the war. He frequently appeared in Pennsylvania courts in behalf of fugitive slaves, and in the State constitutional convention of 1837 refused to sign the Pennsylvania constitution limiting the right of suffrage to white men. His first appearance on the National political stage was in 1849 when he represented his State in Congress. For the next four years he was a leader of the radical wing of the Whigs and Free Soilers, and strongly opposed the Compromise measures of 1850, and was even more bitter in his denunciation of the fugitive slave law than Sumner. In 1855 he took a prominent part in the organization of the Republican party in Pennsylvania, and in 1856 was a delegate to the first Republican National convention, in which he vainly opposed the nomination of John C. Frémont, who was defeated in the election by the Democratic candidate, James Buchanan.

Stevens returned to the Lower House of Congress in 1859, and naturally opposed Buchanan. He bitterly criticized what he considered the vacillation of the Buchanan

administration; and his leadership and influence had grown to such an extent by the time Lincoln came into office that on July 4, 1861, he was made chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. James G. Blaine said of him that, "he was the natural leader who assumed his place by common consent." But throughout his leadership, he always opposed executive authority, and, like Sumner, was a staunch believer in the rule of Congress in public affairs. More than three-score years does not seem to have changed this philosophy in the halls of Congress, where to-day the Senate, particularly, appears to believe that it is the supreme power in the affairs of government.

Stevens from the outset was opposed to Lincoln. During the war he was one with Sumner in advocating the emancipation of the slaves, and ardently advocated the raising of Negro troops, which was done. He never believed in being lenient with the Southerners in any degree, as was Lincoln, who was more broad-minded and more magnanimous. It was on the motion of Stevens that the two Houses in joint session in December, 1865, appointed a joint commission on reconstruction; and in a speech following the creation of the commission, he declared that the rebellion *ipso facto* had blotted out of being all States in the South; that the section was a "conquered province"; and that its government was in the hands of Congress, which could reconstruct it in accordance with the wishes and beliefs of its members. He was made chairman of the joint reconstruction commission, and as such, introduced what became the basis of the Re-

construction act of 1867 and the Fourteenth Amendment. He advocated the Freedmen's Bureau; and he became so violently bent upon punishing the South that he favored the confiscation of the property of the Confederate States and "of the real estate of 70,000 rebels who own above 200 acres each, together with the lands of their several States," for the benefit of the freedmen and the "loyal whites," and to reimburse those who suffered from Lee's invasion of Pennsylvania. There was a grim humor about all this because when the soldiers in gray attacked Chambersburg, Pa., they destroyed the ironworks there which, as fate would have it, were owned by Stevens.

No man in Congress was more vindictive or more revengeful toward the South. His measures and his works and his speeches, together with those of Sumner, only served to intensify racial hatreds, increased the difficulties of solving the race problem, and finally forced the white people of the South into the Democratic party, where they have remained consistently to this day. Perhaps many in the South have forgotten Sumner and Stevens; perhaps there are many there who in the present generation probably have never heard of them; but there are conditions in the South to-day, there are prejudices, and, it must be said, many injustices in the South to-day, which must be laid, in the final analysis, at the doors of these men.

Stevens was such an extreme partisan in politics that he was not even content to let death remove the bitterness that the slavery issue and the Negro problem had brought upon the country. He died in Washington in

1868, in the very midst of the most perilous times of reconstruction, and was buried in a small graveyard at Lancaster, Pa. On his tombstone is the following epitaph, written by himself:

“I repose in this quiet and secluded spot, not from any natural preference for solitude, but, finding other cemeteries limited as to race by charter rules, I have chosen this, that I might illustrate in my death the principles I have advocated through a long life—Equality of Man Before His Creator.”

CHAPTER IV

KU KLUX

Nearly three months before Lee surrendered at Appomattox, the Federal House of Representatives, confident that the North would be victorious, concurred in the vote of the Senate in favor of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, abolishing slavery throughout the Union. It was the irony of fate that four years earlier Congress had submitted to the States another Thirteenth Amendment which prohibited it from interfering with slavery in the States. The war prevented its ratification; and now the abolitionist leaders were bent upon legalizing and re-enforcing Mr. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. By the 18th of December, 1865, the amendment had been ratified and was proclaimed in force. In April, 1866, the Civil Rights Bill was passed over President Johnson's veto. It declared the freed slaves to be citizens of the United States, with the same civil rights as white persons, and provided for punishment of any one who should discriminate or attempt to discriminate against the Negro. And to reënforce this act, Congress, in June, 1866, provided for submitting to the States the Fourteenth Amendment, which gave the constitutional guarantee of citizenship and equal civil rights to freed slaves. It also provided that when in any State the right to vote should be denied to any male inhabitants twenty-one years of age and citi-

zens of the United States, except for participation in a rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation in the State should be reduced in the proportion which the number of such citizens bore to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in the State. This obviously left the Southern States the option of granting suffrage to the Negro or suffering a proportionate reduction in the number of representatives in Congress.

On top of these oppressive and humiliating Congressional maneuvers came the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, which provided for the military government of the Southern States. It divided the South into five military districts, each to be placed under a Federal military commander, whose duty it was to preserve law and order using, at his discretion, either local civil tribunals or military commissions. On the 23rd of March, Congress passed a supplementary reconstruction act which provided that in the registration of voters the district commanders were required to administer an oath which excluded from the right to vote those who had been disfranchised for taking part in the rebellion, and those who, after holding State or Federal office, had given aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States was appealed to, but the radicals in Congress threatened to take away the appellate jurisdiction of the court, and if necessary abolish the Court by constitutional amendment. Mississippi attempted to secure an injunction to prevent the carrying out of the Reconstruction acts, and Georgia asked the Court to enjoin the military authorities; but the Court refused to consider the

appeals on the ground that it had no jurisdiction. This is not surprising when it is remembered that Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, who presided over the Court at the time and wrote the refusal, all his life had been an uncompromising and vigorous opponent of slavery. As a member of Congress he had opposed the Compromise Measures of 1850 and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. He had been an ardent member of the Free Soil party, which favored the abolition of slavery in the territory and in the District of Columbia. Indeed, it was he who drafted the Free Soil platform in 1848, and it was through his influence that Van Buren was nominated for the Presidency in that year. He was the Secretary of the Treasury in Mr. Lincoln's cabinet from 1861 to 1864, and came under the influence of men like Seward and Sumner. So when he was appointed to the Supreme bench in 1864, it was but natural that he should plead the want of jurisdiction in the Mississippi and Georgia cases, a position which now seems to be indefensible. His decision in the case of Texas vs. White in 1869, in which the famous phrase, "an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States" was used, was nothing more than an approval of the policies of the Reconstruction Congress.

The South, then, could find no comfort in the legislative or judicial branches of government, and inasmuch as Johnson, the only friend she had left, was checked every time he showed her any leniency, little help or comfort could be expected from the executive. In 1868 Johnson's impeachment trial was staged, resulting in his vindication by one vote. And the following year he re-

tired into private life in the hill regions of Tennessee where the population for the most part was composed of small planters and "poor white trash," and from which Johnson through sheer ability and personal endeavor, had risen to the highest office in the land. But before Johnson relinquished the Presidency he firmly and courageously made plain his opinion of the Reconstruction Congress's policies. He believed that it established martial law in time of peace; that it suspended the writ of habeas corpus; that it actually destroyed all evidence of a Republican form of government in the South; and that the whole thing was unconstitutional and tyrannical. The South agreed with him wholeheartedly, and in the decade that followed his retirement, they translated his beliefs into acts which brought into being the Solid South of to-day.

The North was now in full swing with its military reconstruction and with what it believed was even more important, the organization of the Negro vote. The "carpet-baggers" from the North made their appearance. Many of these men were adventurers who went South in the belief that it offered an opportunity to become rich at the expense of Southern impoverishment. They represented the worst type of white man on the continent. They were shrewder and far more unscrupulous than the "poor white trash" in the South. They became the political managers of the freed Negroes, and were aided and abetted in their purposes by the "scalawags," a term of opprobrium the Southerners gave to the native whites who aided the Northerners in the reconstruction work. Secret Societies such as the Union League were formed.

The Union League was organized in Ohio in 1862, and was composed of Unionists in eighteen Northern States and throughout many of the Southern commonwealths. In the South it taught the Negroes equality of men and the right to own their former masters' property. It prohibited the so-called "moral control" of the Negroes by former masters. Its radical leaders controlled the votes of the blacks during reconstruction; and Negroes who voted against its wishes frequently were whipped and persecuted, and sometimes put to death. The League went out of existence in 1870 after it had engendered widespread hatred between the whites and blacks in the South, and had forced the Southerners to be harsher toward the Negroes than they would have been otherwise. It was through the work of the "carpet-baggers," the "scalawags" and the members of the Union League and minor organizations that the Solid South gradually began to crystallize. From 1868 to 1870, the Negroes were in the majority in South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana. In Georgia the races were about evenly balanced while in Virginia, North Carolina, Arkansas and Texas they were in the minority. In 1868 the Northerners, having placed the Negroes in power, had carried everything before them; and conditions were becoming so intolerable that the Southern whites began to make plans to combat the Reconstructionists in the most effective way they could devise.

At first the white leaders in the South were divided on the best means of putting a check to what now was developing into Negro supremacy. Negro officials were

being elected and Negro legislators were being sent to State capitals under the encouragement and guidance of the tyrannical rule of the "carpet-bagger," the native renegades and the Negro politicians. It was suggested in some quarters that those white Southerners who were entitled to vote should register and then stay away from the polls, in order to defeat the constitutions made under Negro suffrage, for the constitutions could only be ratified by a majority of the registered voters. But this procedure was too mild an affair for the hot-blooded men of the South who day after day were chafing under Northern despotism. There was but one thing left for them to do—and they did that with a vengeance which has left a stain on the history of the Solid South and an abiding reminder of the stupidity of the whole Federal Congressional Reconstruction policy.

Between 1865 and 1876 there came into being in different parts of the South secret organizations of young white men, whose purpose it was to destroy the control of the "carpet-baggers," the "scalawags" and Negro politicians. These included the Ku Klux Klan, the Knights of the White Camelia, the White Brotherhood, the White League, the Pale Faces, the Constitutional Union Guards, the Black Cavalry, the White Rose, The '76 Association, and a number of smaller and less important organizations. Of this group the Ku Klux Klan and the Knights of the White Camelia were the most important. In the beginning the Ku Klux Klan was a rather mild affair. It was organized in Pulaski, Tennessee, in 1866, as a social club for young men; but it had a weird ritual and a strange

and altogether horrifying uniform. It was by a mere accident that a member discovered that the uniform put the fear of God—and the fear of the devil—into the heart of the Negro. That produced the germ of an idea, and the idea became general in the South.

The White Camelia was organized in Louisiana in 1867 and later joined forces more or less with the Ku Klux Klan. By the time these organizations had spread throughout the South, "carpet-bag" and Negro rule was at its worst. Ideas of social and political equality were being broadcast; Negro insurrection in some places was being fomented to bring the obdurate whites around; Negro militia were being armed and equipped and driven to attack the whites and disarm them; and to top all of this there frequently were outrages upon white women by black men. This last was the crowning weight of intolerableness, so the Ku Klux Klan adopted a constitution and began its cruel and bloody work.

The Prescript or constitution of the Klan, adopted in 1867, and revised in 1868, established the South as an "Invisible Empire," under a Grand Wizard, General Nathan B. Forrest, an illiterate, but able and gallant Confederate cavalry officer. Each State was a Realm under a Grand Dragon; several counties formed a Dominion under a Grand Titan; each county was a Province under a Grand Giant; and the smallest division was a Den under a Grand Cyclops. Leaders bore such titles as Genii, Hydras, Furies, Goblins, Night Hawks, Magi, Monks and Turks; and the private members were called Ghouls. The Klan was not unlike the Carbonari, a secret society,

which played an active part in the history of France and Italy early in the nineteenth century. The Italian organization was curious and mysterious and had a fantastic ritual full of symbols taken from the Christian religion. The Klan also was similar in some respects to the "Tugendbund," or League of Virtue, which, following Napoleon's defeat of Prussia, endeavored to build up a strong spirit of patriotism to offset the lack of morale which a French victory had produced. In some respects it was like the Confrères of France, notably the one founded in Paris in the fourteenth century to assist pilgrims in their journeys to the Holy Land; and it was not unlike the Freemasons, as they operated in Catholic countries, and the Vehmgericht, or Fehmlic Courts, which during the Middle Ages exercised a powerful and sometimes sinister jurisdiction in Germany and more especially in Westphalia. Such organizations inevitably are the outgrowths of oppression and tyranny; and even in the early days of Christianity were resorted to, in various forms, to protect the Christians against persecutions.

The spirits of protection, indignation and retaliation were strong among the members of the Ku Klux Klan, and it required little urging on the part of their leaders to begin a campaign which proved to be an era of lawlessness, cruelty and bloodshed that lasted from 1865 to 1875. The Tennessee Klan, above mentioned, when it had discovered that their regalia frightened the Negro, immediately began to take advantage of the fact. Weird and horrendous tales were told to the Negroes to frighten

them from roaming about and pilfering from their former masters. Members carried a flesh bag in the shape of a heart, and went about "hollering for fried nigger meat." Upon one occasion a Klan member represented himself as having been killed six years before at the battle of Manassas, "and since then some one has built a turnpike over his grave and he has to scratch like hell to get up through the gravel." Another member carried an India-rubber stomach, to startle a Negro by swallowing pailfuls of water. These harmless beginnings gradually grew into cruelties and killings.

At the height of its power, General Forrest, the Grand Wizard, estimated the Klan organization in Tennessee alone at 40,000, and a similar number had organized in other States. The members were sworn to secrecy, under the penalty of death for a violation of their oaths. Well armed and mounted on horses, many of which had had experience in the Confederate cavalries, they began to patrol the South at night, their long white gowns providing a spectacle that the strongest Negro heart could not withstand. The timid and superstitious blacks were terrified when they saw them and sincerely believed they were ghosts. The Klansmen found keen enjoyment in all this. Then the more daring among them began surrounding and breaking into the Negro cabins and frightened and maltreated the inmates. Sometimes they were warned of a future vengeance; again they were severely whipped. Then the Klansmen, fevered by the success of their operations, suddenly were seized with bloodthirst-

iness, although to their credit it must be said that this was aggravated by the attacks on white women by blacks, which were becoming more and more numerous.

The time came when the Klansmen did not hesitate to carry off an undesirable Negro politician or "carpet-bagger," hang him to a tree and riddle his body with bullets. This was the beginning of the long record of lynchings in the South. Finally the Klan systematized its bloody work. It put a ban on promiscuous cruelties and killings; but went about them in an orderly manner. Meetings were held in secret places, usually in the woods, for the purpose of frightening the Negroes. The manner of making raids and punishing Negroes and "carpet-baggers" was prescribed by regulations. All raids, punishments and killings first must be agreed upon and mapped out in meetings. Secret signals and watchwords were adopted. And when punishment was to be inflicted on a victim, the raiders came from a distant locality, to avoid recognition. The same kind of thing is practiced by lynchers in the South to-day.

The operations of the Klan finally began to embrace whippings, killings and the most agonizing mutilations, comparable to those practiced in the Middle Ages by religious fanatics. Although these acts were frequent throughout the South, North Carolina became the scene of the worst cruelty and bloodshed. A notable case in that State was the fate of a white man named Outlaw, a member of the Union League, who was condemned by the Klan, sentenced and executed. He was taken from his home in Alamance county about midnight in February,

1870, by a band of from eighty to one hundred men and hanged to the limb of an elm tree near the court-house door. In the same county a simpleton who was supposed to have seen some of his neighbors who had taken part in the killing of Outlaw, was drowned in a pond for fear that he might talk. Two Negroes in the county were shot, and fifty were whipped. In Caswell county, a member of the State Senate, named J. W. Stevens, was killed, and a white man and a Negro were whipped. In Catawba county, twenty-two men were whipped and one was shot. In nearly all the other counties there were similar records of whippings and killings. The story is told that a revenue agent, while traveling in Orange county, in which six men had been hanged and as many more whipped, came upon the bodies of two Negroes hanging from a tree limb. Some Negro women and children were standing near by weeping. They begged him to read a paper which had been attached to one of the bodies. He did so; and the paper bore the inscription, "Barn-burners and women-insulters." The tragedy of the deaths of these Negroes, as learned later, was the fact that they had been threatened and intimidated into setting fire to a half dozen barns in the county, by their "carpet-bagger" leaders.

Such acts were particularly prevalent in North Carolina, but they also were typical of what the Klan was doing throughout the South. The State of Virginia probably was freer of such lawlessness than any other. In a report made to the United States Senate in 1871, it was declared that in ninety-nine counties in different Southern States there were 526 killings and more than 2,000

whippings attributed to the Klan, that in Louisiana alone in 1868 the Klan was guilty of 1,000 homicides. With the exception of Virginia, similar figures were given for other States from time to time.

By the summer of 1868 all the former Confederate States, except Virginia, Mississippi and Texas, had, under the compulsion of the Congressional-military reconstruction program, ratified the Fourteenth Amendment, and by 1870 the remaining three States had ratified it. Having satisfied the requirements of the Reconstruction acts, Arkansas, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana and Florida, were in the summer of 1868 entitled to representation in Congress. Tennessee had been readmitted to the Union in 1866; and when Virginia, Mississippi and Texas were restored in 1870, reconstruction technically was completed, but Congress was not done with it yet.

In 1868 Ulysses S. Grant was elected, following a campaign in which reconstruction was the issue. Horatio Seymour, the Democratic candidate, favored the Lincoln-Johnson plan of reconstruction, while Grant favored the Congressional program. On March 30, 1870, the Fifteenth Amendment was adopted and proclaimed establishing universal manhood suffrage, but particularly designed to give the Negro the right to vote. As was to be expected the Southern States in the Congressional election of 1870 went Democratic; and this gave the Republican members of Congress such concern that they forthwith enacted enforcement legislation providing penalties for violations of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments,

and reënacted the Civil Rights Act of 1866. In 1871 and 1872 measures were passed providing for the Federal supervision of Congressional elections; and Ku Klux acts were enacted for the purpose of still further increasing the power of the Federal Courts to enforce the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. They authorized the President to suspend the writ of habeas corpus and use military force, if necessary, to prevent the intimidation of Negro voters by the whites. By this time, however, the Ku Klux Klan had accomplished its main purposes. But the Southerners were beginning to believe that the North intended to apply martial law over them and oppress them until the end of time; then a fortunate thing happened. The more intelligent Northern people began to see the folly of such persistent oppression on the part of the Northern radicals in Congress, and public opinion in the North demanded more leniency. The result was the repeal of the "iron-clad oath" for former Confederates in 1871, and the passage of the General Amnesty Act of 1872, which restored the white Southerners to their former civil rights.

In 1872, it was estimated, the public debts of the eleven reconstructed States had reached \$132,000,000. Legislative expenses had been shamefully extravagant, for which Negro members of the legislature were largely responsible. Most of them were reckless, and many of them were corrupt in the matter of expenditures. During this year the control of the electoral machinery was still in the hands of the Republicans who were using the Negroes as pawns; and nearly all the State governments

were being made bankrupt through bad management and corruption.

In spite of such conditions, the South began, in 1872, to look up economically. The use of fertilizers and the employment of more intelligent white labor produced good cotton crops. Mines and manufactures began to develop, and new communities began coming into being as a result of renewed economic activity. In the cotton areas Negroes became the tenants of the plantation owners and worked the crops on shares. Negro labor was being employed at fair wages; but the problem of Negro labor was a difficult one. Politics continued to aggravate racial friction. It was beginning to dawn on the intelligent citizens in the North and South that America—particularly the South—was confronted with a new political and social question, the Negro problem. And the North, in time, characteristically left the South to solve it as best she could.

In 1877, President Hayes removed the last remaining Federal troops from Southern territory. The withdrawal permitted the South to solve her local problems without further National interference. It was the signal for the delivery of the Solid South from a long and terrible travail. It was the beginning of a new era of reconstruction which brought into being a New South that is hardly different politically and sentimentally from the Old South, but which to-day challenges any other section of America economically.

CHAPTER V

THE NEGRO

When the last Federal troops had been removed from the South, the former Confederate States were now left free to work out their own destiny; but their problems were so many and so difficult that to the strongest optimists it appeared to be a hopeless task. State governments and cities, communities and individuals were bankrupt. The South was without the means to buy machinery for manufactures or implements for agriculture. Its manpower had been reduced and weakened by the war; and to top all its burdens it had 4,000,000 freed Negroes with whom by the force of circumstances it must live and recognize as citizens on a par with the best type of white citizen in the South.

Contrary to what has been said and written about the treatment of the slaves by their masters, cruelties in antebellum days were rare. The State of Georgia probably was the most notorious of the Southern States in her treatment of the blacks before the Civil War. She had more slaves than any other State, and there were many reports of mistreatment and cruelty within her borders; but generally throughout the South the slaves were treated with the utmost kindness by plantation owners. On many of the plantations they were taught to read and write, and were reared in Christian atmospheres. When they

were ill they were cared for with as much concern by the white mistress of the plantation as if they were her own children. The pictures Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe and other abolitionists painted of Negro cruelties were exaggerations and more often than not had little if any basis of truth.

The relationship between the slaves and their masters was such that the Negroes became devoted to their white owners, and the latter formed a real affection for the blacks. A pathetic story is told of how when Hunter's Federal troops penetrated the Shenandoah valley of Virginia and herded away Negro women and children on forced marches they fell by the wayside and begged to be allowed to return to the "Marster" and "Missus"; and many of them did steal away and returned to their old plantation homes where they remained with their former owners and shared their poverty and hardships until the end of their lives. White owners of slaves, men and women alike, wept when their slaves in whom they trusted left them. A story is told of how a Southern major a decade or two after the war chanced to run across a former slave in the city of Washington. The man was old and bent and white-haired. When the Major spied him, he shook a cane at him and exclaimed, "Come here, you damned scoundrel! Where have you been all these years?" The aged Negro fell on his knees, bowed his head Moslem fashion and cried, "Lawd, marster, you is de fust gentman I'se seen since I lef' home." When he arose the two men shook hands and embraced. The Major learned that the old Negro had been extended

what amounted to social equality by some of the Washington white people but that that was all they had extended him, so he returned to the South with his former master.

There were times in the South when the bluest-blooded white babies were fed at the breasts of Negro women. This was done when the child's mother could not feed it; and those were days when pasteurized milk was unknown. Small white boys grew up to manhood in close companionship with Negro lads, and the affection between them was genuine and abiding. The Negro boys never overstepped their bounds; nor would the white lads, particularly when they were nearing their maturity, permit them to do so.

It is doubtful that one Negro in a thousand in the South knew what the Civil War was being fought about until Lincoln issued his proclamation in 1863. When it was issued, it was the beginning of what was to become America's so-called Negro problem—a problem which the nation still faces and which it has not yet adequately solved.

The emancipation of the slaves had no sooner been broadcast throughout the South than the attitude of the whites toward the blacks changed to a revolutionary degree. Negroes now were looked upon as enemies, because they were being used by the Northerners as soldiers and because their freedom was a weapon in Lincoln's hands with which to win the war. Indignation was the first reaction of the whites; then followed a genuine dislike; and dislike grew into hatred; so that by the time the Ku

Klux Klan had made its appearance Negroes collectively were looked upon by the white Southerners with as much aversion as were the "damned Yankees."

If these pages have appeared to smack of an apology for the white people of the South in their attitude toward the North and particularly toward the Negroes, such a thing has not been intended. In any event, one cannot write of the South and her history without writing as truly and as honestly as one is capable of doing of the tragic history of the Negro—a history which is as tragic in its shaping to-day, in many ways, as it was before and immediately after the Civil War.

Lincoln's famous proclamation thrust upon the South a freed population of 4,000,000 Negroes. Their presence in this country, in the first place, had been against their will, and marks an imperishable stain upon the white races who brought them over and upon the white races who held them in bondage. Beginning with the appearance of a Dutch slaveship off Virginia's shores in 1619, the slave trade was carried on along the American coast from New England, until the year 1700. After that time slave trading was confined to the Southern States; and after 1808, in which year the slave trade legally was abolished, thousands of blacks were smuggled into the South. In the far South and along the South Atlantic coast they were badly needed to work the cotton, tobacco and rice crops.

How the slave finally became the occasion of the Civil War has been described. We have now passed through the Civil War period and part of the Reconstruction

period to the year 1877. What was the condition of the Negro population in the year 1877? In South Carolina and Mississippi there were more Negroes than white people. Was the Negro of 1877 the same kind of Negro who was brought to America in the seventeenth century? Was he the same kind of Negro who was brought to America early in the nineteenth century?

The answer to these questions forms one of the greatest tragedies in our brief but eventful history. The answer to these questions forms the blackest mark against the white men of the South that could be placed against any race of any color in the world. That answer is the mulatto. In the year 1877, it is estimated, from one-fifth to one-third of the so-called Negroes in the South had white blood in their veins; and to-day it is estimated that one-third of the Negroes in the United States have white blood in them. After 1877 the mixture had become so prevalent and so obvious that the States began passing laws defining the status of the Negro, and to-day a Negro in nearly all the States, by statute, is "a person who has one-eighth or more of African blood."

Sophisticated persons and historical-minded persons might be inclined to consider lightly the mulatto as the natural outgrowth of any condition in which two alien races are thrown together. But the tragedy of the mulattoes is not merely in the fact that the white blood in them was the blood of inferior whites and middle-class whites. The tragedy is that hundreds of them, thousands of them, possess the finest white blood in the South—aristocratic blood, if you will. "Why is this a tragedy,"

you might ask, "when the mulattoes themselves are proud of their white blood?" Perhaps that is true in many cases, nevertheless their status is the same socially as that of the very blackest Negro. To understand what this means one must remember that not a few, but many, of the mulattoes are blood kin to the F. F. V.'s in Virginia, to the first families in South Carolina, and to the blue bloods in the other Southern States, but they cannot, of course, be accepted as kinsmen. It is known, too, that certain prominent white bachelors in certain States in the South reared large families of mulattoes by Negro mistresses, and one notable case is that of a member of the Court of Appeals in one of the leading States in the South. The mulattoes are proud of their blood, as was an old mulatto mammy who chided her jet black companion with the remark, "Quit talkin', child, I'se got white blood in me." Whereupon the ebony-colored person retorted, "Dat mought be so, but my color, jes' de same, is hono'-ble."

No more pathetic confession is to be found in the biographies of the world, than that which was written by the late Booker T. Washington, in his volume, "Up from Slavery." He frankly admitted that he never knew the identity of his father, but had been told that he was a white man. In Franklin county, Virginia, where Washington was born, there is the persistent notion that he was the son of a man who became a famous seafighter; but this has never been proved. One of the tragedies of the mulatto, in so far as he himself is concerned, is his inability to prove his lineage on his paternal side. This is

not displeasing to the whites; but what of the Negro who has inherited the talents and noble aspirations of a white ancestor? He is not permitted to follow in the footsteps of that ancestor. He must in the South go the way of the lowly laborer, more times than not, and work side by side with an ignorant black. All the better class of Negroes, including the more prominent leaders and men of talent, have been and are mulattoes. I confess that I am not prepared to offer a solution of what has come to be the so-called Negro problem. I am merely presenting truths about one phase of that problem which cannot be denied. The abolitionists and the radical members of the Reconstruction Congress tried to solve it, but what happened?

Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments all were designed to solve the Negro problem. The Lincoln edict abolished slavery in the South; the Thirteenth Amendment abolished it by organic law throughout the Union; the Fourteenth made him a citizen; and the Fifteenth made him a voter. Commenting on the revolutionary change in the status of the Southern Negro during a period of ten years, four of which years were spent in fighting the Civil War, Viscount James Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," declared, "Rights which the agricultural laborers of England did not obtain until 1885, were thrust upon these children of nature, whose highest form of pleasure had hitherto been to caper to the strains of a banjo."

That is putting it too mildly. If the Northern recon-

structionists had had their way, Negro governors and members of State legislatures would be ruling the Southern States to-day. But time proved that Lord Bryce had no reason for commiserating the Southern whites. The Southerners soon found means of making the Negroes' "rights," rights in name only; and while the practical nullification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution in the South continues as the natural outgrowth of the South's determination to maintain white supremacy, nothing is more anomalous in the history of governments than the Negro in the South to-day. He not only has been deprived, by various devices, of his right of suffrage; he not only has been deprived of his right to hold a public office; but in some States, notably in Georgia, he has been deprived of his right to make a living in the way he has chosen. If the shade of Thaddeus Stevens is capable of discerning the treatment of the Negro in the South his body must be turning over in its lonely grave at Lancaster.

It is only fair to say something about the Negro in the North. Before doing so, it is interesting to review the population figures, according to the census of 1920. According to the census report of that year there were approximately 16,000,000 white persons in the eleven Southern States which seceded from the Union, and 8,000,000 of the 10,000,000 Negroes in the Union, live in the South. This reveals that only about two per cent. of the country's Negro population to-day lives in the other States in the Union. It is interesting to note that there are 7,000,000 white persons in the New England States and

only 745,000 Negroes. There are not as many Negroes in the whole of New England as there are in each of the States of Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina. Now let us look at the populous States in the East, the Middle West and the West. Illinois has about 6,000,000 white persons and 182,000 Negroes; New York has 10,000,000 white persons and over 200,000 Negroes; Pennsylvania has 8,000,000 white persons and 284,000 Negroes; California has 3,000,000 white persons and 38,000 Negroes. These are 1920 census figures. The District of Columbia is the only area in what may be termed the North—although it is below the Mason and Dixon line—in which there is almost an equal number of whites and blacks.

These figures show that the Negro problem is essentially the South's problem. The figures, however, bring up interesting questions involving the North's attitude toward the Negro. In the South Jim Crow laws of various kinds have been enacted on the railroads and street cars. The schools throughout the South are separated. Negroes are not allowed in white hotels; and when they are permitted in theaters, they must go to sections especially blocked off for them. In the North, save in the case of hotels, cafés and restaurants, the Negro is granted all the rights the white man enjoys. But one is constrained to ask whether the white Northerners would find pleasure in extending these civil rights to the Negroes if the 8,000,000 Southern Negroes were in the North and the 2,000,000, scattered throughout the Union, were in the South. How would New York and Pennsylvania feel about the matter if their Negro population was greater

than the white, as it is in Mississippi and South Carolina? I do not ask these questions to offend the Negroes nor to raise a controversy over the so-called Negro problem; but it is desirable to show in a most convincing manner that the North and the South have Negro problems of widely differing degrees.

There is no good reason for mincing words over the subject. The Northern people recognize the inherent racial differences between the white and black races just as readily as the Southerners; and they display their real feelings when they are put to the test as readily as the Southerners. A review of recent history will prove this. It is estimated that during the World War period,—that is, the period of America's participation in the conflict,—approximately 500,000 Southern Negroes migrated to the industrial centers of the North and Middle West. In nearly every center in which they settled race clashes, and sometimes serious race riots, broke out. In Washington, D. C., six persons were killed and many were wounded. In Chicago, 36 were killed. In Philadelphia many persons were wounded in a race fight; and there were serious race riots in New London, Conn., Bloomington, Ill., Syracuse, N. Y., New York City, Coatesville, Penn., Scranton, Penn., and Darby, Penn.¹ The situation became so seri-

¹ The *New York Times* covering a period from 1917 to 1919, inclusive, shows that there were as many as five riots in New York City. There was one in the San Juan section of the city in July, 1917; another in Harlem in April, 1918; one at Price Street, Brooklyn, in October, 1918; and two in Harlem, March and July, 1919, respectively. In a riot in Harlem in March, 1919, 3,000 whites and blacks participated. In some of these riots several persons were killed and many injured. Page numbers and dates concerning these riots can be found in the *New York Times* index, for the years mentioned.

ous in the North that Senator Curtis of Kansas introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for a Senatorial investigation. In the city of Omaha, in 1919, a mob bent upon lynching a young Negro who was alleged to have attacked a white girl, seized Mayor Edward P. Smith, who was appealing to them to let the law take its course, placed a rope around his neck and dragged him through the street. He died a few hours later.

Such outbursts are periodical. Meanwhile, it is noteworthy that in spite of Supreme Court decisions against the enforced segregation of Negroes in the cities, the Negroes in the North as well as in the South, are living in separate communities. Harlem, in New York City, is a case in point; and there are similar communities in Chicago, Philadelphia, and Washington. It is true that in these cities there are streets on which whites and blacks live side by side; but the whites always are of the middle or even an inferior class. The Negroes, particularly the mulattoes, resent discrimination, and naturally resent anything that has the appearance of denying them their civic rights; but it is not in the South alone that the whites show an antipathy for the Negro. This antipathy is a fact that cannot be denied; and it is one of the first things that must be recognized by both races if they ever hope to solve the Negro problem.

The Southern white not only understands the Negro better than the Northern white, but he is more honest in his attitude toward him. When I say this I recognize that technically it is wrong to deny the Negro the right of suffrage or any other of his civic rights; but the South's

honesty is based upon a fact—which many Northerners are beginning to recognize—that the two races must live together, apart. That is to say, there can never be any widespread social intercourse between them. The racial differences are too strong to permit it. Why God created these differences is something for God to explain. The white man cannot explain it; but the Southern white recognizes it and tries to meet it in a sensible way. At the same time he has an affection for the Negro; he is quick to be his real friend in time of need; and he holds for him a genuine sympathy in his struggle against odds over which he himself has had no control or voice. The churches are not altogether honest in their dealings with the Negro; nor are the politicians. In the case of the churches, particularly in the North, the attitude of the white ministers toward a black brother of the cloth usually is hardly more than toleration, and sometimes it is the most obvious racial antipathy. This was illustrated in a meeting of ministers in a Northern city recently in which a white clergyman refused to sit by a Negro minister at a conference.

In the circumstances, the white Southerners believe they are honest in their treatment of the Negro in so far as social intercourse is concerned. Whether their God will forgive them for the crime of the mulatto is something I cannot pass upon; but I do know that the reason and the only reason why they attempt to deny the Negro his political and sometimes his civic rights, is because they are afraid that his next desire will be social equality, some-

thing which they rightfully consider to be impossible.

In the matter of charity, self-sacrifice and downright nobility, the Southern white is not surpassed by his brothers in the North. He no longer hates the Negro as such, as he did during the days of reconstruction. His attitude toward him is based upon a fundamental truth which the people of this country must recognize if they desire to avert serious trouble at some time in the future. It is a tragic state of affairs, and certainly one for which no man in his wildest dreams can blame the Negro. His presence, here, the result of the greed and inhumanity of our ancestors, historically is a wrong that Constitutional amendments, Supreme Court decisions and statutory enactments cannot atone. His presence in America to-day is a violation of all the finer principles of government and all the noblest sentiments of religion. His presence here is the result of what no man, of whatever color, should be made to endure—slavery.

Who can read the plaintive poems of Paul Dunbar, of another generation, or of Countee Cullen, of this generation, without realizing that in the Negro race in America are souls that aspire to the stars? And who are there among the whites who would deny them the beauty of the stars? But emotions, dreams and talents—art itself—cannot eradicate the distinguishing lines that Nature lays down, even though, in doing so, she buries the heart of a poet beneath the dust of caste, or stills with the cries of inherent aversion the songs of the sweetest singer.

I must confess that I know of no race in the wide world

to-day that deserves more pity and sympathy, and admiration for its courage and nobility, than the Negro race in America; and I believe when I say this that I voice the sentiments of those white people who reside in the Solid South.

CHAPTER VI

WHITE SUPREMACY

In Grant's first term, many of the Reconstruction policies which were a part of his platform were carried out. The Fifteenth Amendment was formally adopted and proclaimed on March 30, 1870. Grant, it should be remembered, was elected largely because of "carpet-bag" rule. His opponent, Seymour, carried only the States of Georgia and Louisiana, while Tennessee and five of the former Confederate States upon which Negro suffrage had been imposed under military reconstruction, had voted for him under compulsion. These were North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama and Arkansas. Virginia, Mississippi and Texas had not yet been readmitted to the Union.

The Fifteenth Amendment was forced upon the South, and it was upon the condition that they ratify it that Virginia, Mississippi, Texas and Georgia were readmitted to the Union in 1870. Not entirely satisfied that the Fifteenth Amendment would force the Southern States to give the Negroes their votes, the Republicans in 1870 enacted measures designed to enforce obedience to the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. They were particularly provoked because in 1868 and 1869 Louisiana and Tennessee had broken away from the Republican col-

umn; while in the Congressional election of 1870 Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia and Alabama had gone Democratic. So the Civil Rights Act of 1866 was reënacted, and this unquestionably had much to do with breaking up, or at least with checking, the operations of the Ku Klux Klan.

Nationally, the Southern States in 1872 were still under the "carpet-bag" rule in so far as Negro votes were concerned, and Grant again was elected, this time over Horace Greeley, editor of the New York *Tribune*, who had protested against the continued use of Federal troops to uphold the Government's reconstruction measures in the South, and who objected particularly to what he believed to be the enormously increasing expenditure of the central government and its hordes of Republican employees whom he described as "patriots for revenue only." Because Greeley had always been a Whig many Democrats in the North refused to vote for him. In 1873 the North was stricken with a financial panic. The reasons for it, briefly, were the overbuilding of railroads, the overcapitalization of many industries, the need of currency to remove crops, heavy land mortgages in the West, unrest occasioned by corruption exposed in Grant's Administration, losses from the Chicago and Boston fires of that year, general extravagance in living in the North, and finally the failure of Jay Cooke and Company. This panic dealt a severe blow to the North, and the South which already was burdened with economic reverses did not escape added suffering and distress, as a result. One bright thing that grew out of the panic for the South, however, was that it was

the beginning of the shaping of public opinion in the North against continued Federal control of the South, particularly if that control was, as Horace Greeley had pointed out, to call for enormous expenditures. The whole country, including the South, suffered from the panic until 1878, the year after Federal troops left the former Confederate States.

In 1874 vigorous political efforts were made by some of the Southern States to throw off Republican domination, which, in effect, still was Negro domination. Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina were especially active; and the situation at one time became so critical that General Sheridan was forced to drive the conservative members out of the Louisiana legislature. At the same time he addressed a letter to President Grant in which he described the Southern whites as "banditti." This created more ill-feeling among the Southerners and an even stronger determination that when the time was ripe they would avail themselves of every means that they could devise to destroy Republican rule.

In 1876 the Democrats for the first time were stronger than they had been since before the Civil War. Hard times in the North and the political scandals in Grant's régime, had turned many Northerners to the Democratic party. The party nominated Samuel J. Tilden, of New York. Although he had been a strong Unionist during the war, he had opposed many of Mr. Lincoln's war measures, and this had pleased the Southerners. Moreover, he had gained some fame as a reformer in connection with his exposure of the Tweed Ring, New York

City, while a member of the Legislature. The Republicans nominated Rutherford B. Hayes, of Ohio, who as a "sound-money" man, during the period of hard times was expected by the Republicans to lift the country out of its financial depression. His followers, however, recognized that he couldn't run on this issue alone, because many Northerners were displeased with the Government's continued control of the South, so James G. Blaine, notably, tried to divert them by keeping up a running fire on the South throughout the election campaign. He delivered philippics against the "rebel control" in the South, and stirred up additional race hatred and additional resentment against Federal oppression. In 1884, the silver-tongued orator, Robert Ingersoll, paid Mr. Blaine the tribute of calling him a "plumed knight" for his fine work.

When the electoral votes were counted it was found that there were two sets of returns from Louisiana, Florida and South Carolina, while one vote of Oregon was in dispute. Hayes needed all of these to elect him; and inasmuch as no method had been devised by the Constitution or by Congress to decide such a problem, an electoral commission of fifteen members was appointed by mutual consent to make a decision which would be accepted as binding. The commission was to be composed of ten Congressmen, five from each party, and five members of the Supreme Court of the United States. This commission was presumed to be bi-partisan, and the country expected it to be above partisanship. Four Supreme Court justices, two Democrats and two Republicans, had chosen a fifth justice, for their representation on the commission.

The fifth justice was a Republican, so this gave the Commission eight Republicans and seven Democrats.

The Republicans on the Commission by a strict party vote on every point that came up perpetrated one of the most glaring cases of injustice against a political party that has been known before or since. To begin with, the choice of Republican electors in Louisiana had been accomplished, so the Democrats claimed, by the rejection of several thousand Democrats by a Republican returning board. The Democrats, therefore, rightfully insisted that the Commission should go behind the returns and correct the injustice. And the Republicans did a grimly humorous thing in view of the fact that they had but nine years before won a war based on their opposition to the doctrine; they held that the State's action was final; and that to go behind the State's action would be invading its sovereignty! It would have been no more ridiculous had they held that to go behind the State's action would be invading its right to institute slavery again. The Commission accepted the Republican contention in this matter and all their other contentions. Bent upon voting strictly according to party, it would not have been surprising had it voted for a Negro for President had that been insisted upon by the Republicans. In any event, the eight to seven vote was constant throughout the procedure, and Hayes was declared elected. The Southerners accepted the verdict quietly, but to this day they believe firmly that Tilden's election was stolen from them,—they have considerable justification for the belief,—and the episode only served to solidify the South all the more against Republicanism.

In 1874 the Congressional elections had increased the Democratic strength to such an extent that the Republicans became alarmed. Pennsylvania, Ohio and Massachusetts went Democratic, and in the Middle Western grain States the Grangers were holding the balance of power, while only a few States in the South could be forced into the Republican column under the military rule. It dawned on Grant that the North was becoming displeased with the use of force, but he was not wise enough to remove it, and in a message to Congress in December, 1874, he declared that without the military control of the South Negro suffrage would be worse than a hollow mockery.

Realizing that a new Congress, which would convene after March 4, 1875, might make legislative changes favorable to the South, the old Republican Congress, in March, 1875, passed a Civil Rights Act, guaranteeing equal rights to Negroes in hotels, public conveyances, and places of amusement and forbidding the exclusion of them from juries. A proposed force bill, designed against the intimidation of Negro voters, however, failed. The Republicans believed that they had established reconstruction measures which would remain in operation so long as a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress could be kept out of power. But they were mistaken in this, as later events proved.

Beginning in 1873 the Supreme Court made a series of rulings which at nearly every turn defeated the purpose of the Reconstruction radicals. To understand the significance of these decisions it is well to review the original

purposes of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and see how the tribunal interpreted them. The primary purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment was to prevent the Southern States from passing hostile laws against the Negroes. It declared that all persons "born or naturalized" in the United States were citizens of the United States and forbade the States from violating the rights of such citizens. All former slaves were born in this country so the amendment applied to them as well as to white natives. The Fifteenth Amendment declared that the State must not deprive a citizen of the United States of the right to vote because of his color.

On April 14, 1874, the Supreme Court rendered an opinion in what were known as the Slaughter House cases. The State of Louisiana in order to abolish a large number of slaughterhouses scattered in different sections of New Orleans, which were regarded as a menace to health, granted a monopoly to a company to establish a central slaughterhouse where all butchers might do their slaughtering on payment of a fee. The act was attacked as unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment, the butchers claiming that it denied them the rights of citizenship. But the Supreme Court in a five to four decision decided that the act was legal; that since the grant of the monopoly had never been a Federal privilege, the Court could not interfere with the State law. In other words the Court laid down the principle that the central Government, after the Civil War, was to continue to be a Federal Government and not a unitary government in which the States were subordinate. In a measure it was

pronouncing the doctrine of State sovereignty, and gave the Southerners their first real hope that in time they could defeat the purposes of the North to give the Negro all the rights that the white man enjoyed.

In the case of the *United States vs. Reese*, the Supreme Court on March 27, 1876, declared that parts of the force bill of 1870 which provided for the use of Federal troops to protect the Negro in his right to vote, were unconstitutional, on the ground that they did not specify that the denial of suffrage must be on the sole ground of race or color. A reasonable prerequisite, such as a poll tax, for voting was permissible. This decision became what the South looked upon as a kind of Magna Charta which would free it from Negro dominance, and in the years that followed it has taken every advantage of it indirectly to deny the Negro of his right of suffrage. But the Court was not done yet.

In the case of the *United States vs. Cruikshanks*, the tribunal in 1876 held that the Amendments to the Constitution left it still the duty of the State rather than the Federal Government, to protect its citizens, even when the whites had mobbed the blacks. The right of the central Government, it was held, was limited to taking care that the State governments and laws offered equal protection to whites and blacks. The Southerners were now beginning to see daylight, from their viewpoint. They knew that, after all, the Supreme Court was a power that the President, Congress, or any other organization in the nation could not diminish—and the Court was favoring the South at every turn. The end was not yet.

In 1883 the tribunal declared the conspiracy clause of the Congressional Ku Klux Act of 1871 unconstitutional and restricted the application of the law to acts of a State through its officers and not to private citizens. In the same year it declared the Civil Rights Act of 1875 invalid. It is important to review the provisions of that act because the Court's decision concerning it, marked a turning point in the South's fight for white supremacy. The act made it criminal for any person to deny to any citizen on account of race or color the full and equal enjoyment of inns, public conveyances, theaters and other places of amusement. The act finally reached the Supreme Court as the result of a hotel-manager in the South having refused accommodations to Negroes; and the Court ruled that the Fourteenth Amendment gave Congress the power to make laws enforcing the amendment, but not the power to regulate internal domestic affairs. The decision contained the principle upon which the South has rested its right to enact Jim Crow laws and upon which the people of the South have rested their right to set up social barriers between themselves and Negroes. That principle was that the Fourteenth Amendment prohibited a State government from discriminating between whites and blacks in its general legislation, but that this by no means prevented a hotel-keeper or theater-manager from making such a discrimination, nor did the amendment give to Congress any power to regulate theaters or hotels. This power, the Court insisted, still remained in the control of the States.

The Court opinions thus far cited reveal that the trib-

unal considered that the Fourteenth Amendment merely aimed to protect the Negro's civil and political rights; but that it did not give him a social status, equal, superior, or otherwise. The matter of giving him whatever status he may have, therefore, has been left to the individuals in the States, and the Southerners naturally have taken advantage of this privilege. The Court summed up its whole attitude on the subject in the case of *Plessy vs. Ferguson* in 1896. The State of Louisiana had required that railway companies in the State should provide equal but separate accommodations for white and Negro passengers. *Plessy*, a Negro, was ejected from a white compartment and was arrested for violating the State law. He protested and finally got his protest before the Supreme Court; but the Court held that the law was constitutional since it did not interfere with the civil or political equality of the races, but was intended rather to preserve peace and good order. The law, the Court said, did not stamp the colored race with any badge of inferiority unless the race chose to put that construction upon it, and equal rights could not be secured to the Negro by an enforced commingling of the two races.

By the year 1870, when the Fifteenth Amendment was ratified, there were approximately 5,000,000 Negroes in the South, and of this number between 800,000 and 900,000 were men of voting age. The potentialities of such an electorate thrown to the Republican column, was an alarming prospect for the Southerners; but fortified by the Supreme Court decisions above mentioned, they began gradually to establish restrictions around the Negroes

which in time vitiated and finally destroyed their voting power. We have already seen how the Ku Klux Klan was used to intimidate the Negro. This organization's method was that of primitive cruelty and violence which ceased, more or less, when the white men felt that the Negroes and "carpet-baggers" had been subdued. Other methods of denying the Negro his right to vote included electoral tricks, such as the theft of ballot boxes, the secretion of ballot boxes, the exchanging of boxes, the removal of polling places to unknown places, the doctoring of returns, false certifications, repeating, the elimination of names from the registry books, and illegal arrests of Negroes before election day. These methods were pursued election year after election year until 1892 when the North Carolina Republicans joined with the Populists of that year and elected a number of State officers and a Negro member of Congress. This alarmed most of the Southern States, so from 1892 to 1904 Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia changed their constitutions so as to bar the Negroes from the polls without violating the Fourteenth or Fifteenth Amendment. It is surprising in view of the anxiety which the Southern States suffered between the years 1877 and 1892, that they had not made constitutional changes before; but their failure probably was due to the difficult process of providing for constitutional conventions or for bringing constitutional amendments before the people. In any event, when the constitutions were changed, it is noteworthy that they were changed in conventions and that the people were not given the oppor-

tunity to ratify them. The reason for this was obvious.

The above named States between 1892 and 1904 adopted among other things in their constitutions what was known as the famous "grandfather clause." The clauses of Alabama, adopted in 1901, and of Virginia, adopted in 1902, were typical. The Alabama clause provided that registration for voting could be, in the option of the registrar, made dependent upon whether the applicant "had served honorably in any war prior to 1898 or in the service of the Confederate States or of Alabama," or upon whether the applicant was the "lawful descendant of such a veteran." The Virginia clause permitted registration to "a person who prior to 1902 served in time of war in the army or navy of the United States, or the Confederate States, or of any State of the United States, or of the Confederate States" or to "a son or grandson of any such person."

These clauses were vigorously enforced until 1915, with the result that up to that time registrars barred every Negro from registering who applied, without question, knowing that it was impossible for a black man to prove service in the Confederate forces.

In 1906 Oklahoma and the Indian Territories were admitted into the Union as the State of Oklahoma, and in December of that year a constitution was adopted by a constitutional convention and ratified in 1907. In the early 80's this section of the country had been settled by adventurers from the South, so it was not surprising that the new State adopted the "grandfather clause" in its organic law. The clause provided that "no person en-

titled to vote on January 1, 1866, in any State, or who then resided in some foreign nation, and no lineal descendant of such a person shall be denied the right to vote because of inability to read and write the Constitution." This, of course, barred all Negroes in the new State from voting and threw Oklahoma into the Democratic column along with the Solid South.

Inasmuch as Oklahoma was a new State the clause caused more bitterness than it had done in the States in the Solid South, and the Negroes made a vigorous protest. Finally a group of them carried their case to the Federal District Court for Oklahoma, and this Court declared the clause unconstitutional. This created consternation and alarm throughout the South, so the State of Oklahoma fought the decision and appealed. The appeal finally reached the United States Supreme Court, and for the first time since the Civil War that tribunal in 1915 favored the Negroes in its interpretation of the Reconstruction Amendment, and declared the "grandfather clause" unconstitutional.

The decision was hailed with delight by the Negroes throughout the nation; and Charles D. Hilles, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, in a public statement declared that the ruling would send Oklahoma into the Republican party. But the Negroes and the Republicans were delighted prematurely. They overlooked the fact that the Supreme Court in its ruling on the "grandfather clause"—and, by the way, the decision was written by a former Confederate soldier, Chief Justice White—declared that States have a right to prescribe edu-

cational tests for their voters. In the opinion of the Southerners this saved the day; for all of them had educational tests, and the decisions on these tests were in the hands of white registrars.

Before the "grandfather clause" had been invalidated, the States which had resorted to it had an optional educational test, but never used it. After the "grandfather clause" was voided they resorted to it with a vengeance, and are still resorting to it. The educational test now used in the South is laid down in typical manner by the Virginia constitution. The applicant for registration must be able to "read any section of the Virginia constitution or understand and give a reasonable interpretation thereof when read to him"; or the registrar may require that the applicant "make application in his own handwriting without aid or suggestion, stating name, age, date and place of birth, residence and occupation at the time and for two years preceding." Presuming that a Negro was able to read any section of the Virginia constitution and even give what a board of constitutional lawyers would consider a "reasonable interpretation" of the document, it must be remembered that the decision as to whether he has fulfilled the provisions of the law is left to the judgment of a white registration official. The result is that no Negro, educated or otherwise, is permitted to register.

Years before the "grandfather clause" was eliminated, Negro leaders in the South, notably Booker T. Washington, urged the members of their race to give up their attempts to acquire the privilege of voting and turn their attention to education. Washington was particularly

anxious that his fellow Negroes learn agriculture and the trades, and this they have done to a remarkable degree at Tuskegee and Hampton; but as long as the literacy tests are conducted as the white registration officials conduct them now, there is no hope that the increasing number of educated Negroes in the South will get the vote. The South is determined that they shall not have it as long as legal methods can be used to keep it from them.

It can be seen that technically the charges that the Southern States are violating the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments are unfounded. Any State in the Union has the constitutional right to deprive a person of the privilege to vote for such reasons as illiteracy, crime, pauperism, insufficient age, or insufficient length of residence in a State. In the final consideration of the Fifteenth Amendment, therefore, it can be said truthfully and constitutionally, that the only voting right which the Fifteenth Amendment grants is freedom from discrimination because of race.

Everything considered, the South thus far has triumphed in its fight against a black electorate. It has learned the constitutional tricks, and though it sometimes makes serious mistakes such as, for example, the barring of Negroes from the Texas primary, and the attempt in Louisiana and in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, to segregate the Negroes by State law and city ordinance it generally has succeeded in destroying in a legal way most of the purposes of the famous Reconstruction Congress. In the circumstances the shades of Sumner and Stevens are gnashing their teeth in Hades, over the way the Solid

South has maintained its white supremacy at the hands of the highest Federal tribunal.

Even though the Supreme Court has ruled in favor of the Negroes in the matter of segregation their victory has been an empty one. The city of Louisville passed an ordinance forbidding Negroes from occupying houses as residences or places of abode, or publicly assembling in blocks where the majority of houses were occupied by white persons, and in like manner forbidding white persons when the conditions as to occupancy were reversed, the interdiction being based upon color and nothing more. The ordinance was protested and carried to the Supreme Court where it was decided that such ordinances passed by a State or municipality were in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Early in 1927 a similar case was brought up from Louisiana, and the Court cited its decision in the Louisville case. These decisions definitely decided for all time the illegality of segregation and they were signals for rejoicing among the Negroes, particularly those in the North. But in 1926 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People carried a case from Washington before the Supreme Court which involved a covenant between individuals, real estate operators and purchasers presumably, stipulating that certain blocks, sections and subdivisions of property should not be sold to persons of certain races, including Negroes, Jews and Italians. The Court unanimously sustained the covenant; held that it was a contract and did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment. In the North, the weakness of such covenants has been found in the fact that real

estate operators break them; but the Court's decision in so far as the South was concerned served to fortify its determination to separate the blacks and whites as well as to deny the blacks their civic rights and rights of suffrage.

In following out what it now looks upon as its constitutional rights to treat the Negro as it does, the South to-day does not consider that its course is an unjust one. Again one must refer to the incontrovertible truth,—which the South recognizes,—that the Negroes in the South are not absorbable; that they cannot expect so 'al equality, even in the North. One might rejoin to this by citing the mulatto; but it must be remembered again that the mulatto is an outcast. He is not in the strict sense a Negro, and he is not a white. He belongs to the twilight group of humanity, and provides one of the foremost racial tragedies of the world. It must be repeated that the black races and white races in America must live together, apart. And it is upon this principle that the Solid South rests her case and fortifies it politically and otherwise.

In view of her traditions and beliefs, in view of her determination to abide by what she considers to be a fundamental truth, it is not surprising that the South, since Reconstruction days, with one or two exceptions, has remained solidly Democratic; and all signs point to the fact that with such deep-rooted convictions in her heart and mind, she is ready to continue to be Democratic, so long as the candidate presented for the party's consideration is white, whether he be a Catholic, a Jew or a Scandinavian.

CHAPTER VII

THE "BIBLE BELT"

A Southern gentleman some years ago upon being asked what church his son was affiliated with, replied that he was affiliated with none; that his offspring was "religiously inclined, but hell-bent." In considerable measure this describes the mental attitude of the people of the South toward religion. I mean by this that, although there are thousands of church-members in the South who profess to follow the tenets of their various denominations, they are as far away from those tenets as if they were not members. This is particularly true of the Baptists, who outnumber all other denominations in the South. It is amazing when one considers the gallant early history of the Baptists in this country, how they fought for religious freedom, how they were the guiding force that influenced Jefferson and Madison in their fight for the separation of Church and State, that the Baptists of the South, in practice to-day, are moving in a diametrically opposite direction. The Methodists are guilty of the same thing. The old Wesleyan idea of love and charity has been substituted by an attempted rule of force and a tragic perversion of the philosophy of brotherly love. The Presbyterians, embracing a more intellectual group, are much the same, so it remains for the Episcopalians and

Catholics in the South to maintain whatever tolerance and liberalism that exists among the churches.

According to a census taken in 1916, the last authoritative one available, there were in that year 4,500,000 Baptists in these Southern States which seceded from the Union in 1860 and 1861. The Methodists numbered 2,275,000, the Presbyterians 400,000 and the Episcopalians 144,000, making a total of approximately 8,000,000 Protestants in the South. The Roman Catholics numbered a little more than 1,000,000, and of this number 900,000 were in Louisiana and Texas. It is not difficult to see why the Protestants rule the thoughts of the people in the South on all social, religious and political questions. And yet there is not literally a "Bible Belt" in the South, as has been vigorously represented by certain writers in recent years. When I say this I mean that the so-called "Bible Belt" is no more confined to the South than it is to New York State, where a Methodist bishop from his pulpit recently declared that "no man who kisses the hand of the Pope will ever be elected President of the United States." Two things in the South prevent its people from actually forming a "Bible Belt." One is rank mental laziness and the other is ignorance. I realize that this statement opposes the pet theories of the brilliant young political and social geographers in the North, who have made long-distance surveys of the various intellectual and religious boundary lines of America. The Baptist and Methodist leaders mix their *ex cathedra pronunciamentos* with sly hints that draw the Southern people to their mental lines without difficulty. For ex-

ample, the Northerner and Catholics are hated in the first place, and when the former is made to appear as a sophisticated unbeliever he is doubly hated. But the people who do the hating care no more for the infallibility of the Bible or for whether man was divinely created than they do for whether Mahomet's coffin swung in the air. They simply accept the mouthings of the spiritual leaders because the spiritual leaders are clever enough to paint the intelligent people of the North as an alien race.

The fact that these people break all the laws known to man and the Good Book is in itself proof enough that they care nothing for the spiritual teachings *per se* of the brethren. In the circumstances the "Bible Belt" is a pure myth. If there is a "Bible Belt" it does not hold up the trousers of orthodoxy. Even the pulpit acrobats themselves do not believe in all the utterances that spring from their lips. Most of them nowadays are well read,—that is, they read the newspapers and the magazines to keep up with current events—and they are smart enough to know that the theory of evolution, for example, is not an attack on Christianity, but why should they throw away their bread and meat to feed, what is to them, non-constructive atheism?

Reverting to statistics, it is interesting to note that the census of 1916 gives the six States in New England almost as large a majority of Catholics over the Protestants as the latter have over the Catholics in the South. The Catholics are particularly plentiful in the State of Massachusetts and in Connecticut. There are a total of 2,500,000 Catholics in New England and 550,000 Prot-

estants, according to the 1916 figures. The Methodists and Baptists together number but 366,000. Catholics also are in a large majority in Illinois, New York and Pennsylvania, the three most populous States in America, so that when the divinely inspired Book and the infallibility of the Pope are considered the real "Bible Belt" in America is in the North and East and not in the South. I dare say that for Bible knowledge three-fourths of the people of the South depend on what their pulpit orators tell them because they don't care a great deal one way or another—but, of course, they are unhappy if a brother of the cloth fails to paint the Northern intellectual as a devil in disguise. "Them damn Northerners think they are smart," a Southerner in nearly any rural section in the South will say as he goes about making his moonshine, seducing his neighbor's daughter, going off with his neighbor's wife or committing murder, arson or assault and battery as the case may be.

The one leavening force in the so-called religious life of the South is the Episcopal church, but unfortunately, this church does not reach the masses. Because of its Catholic ancestry,—I know some of its theologians will dispute me on this,—because of its high degree of intellectuality the Episcopal church refuses to join the ranks of anti-Catholicism. There have been, of course, here and there, certain rectors who believed the Pope is trying to make America a Catholic State, but the majority of the Episcopal brethren are friendly to the Catholics because they are not unlike them in their theology and ritual.

The overwhelming majority that the Protestants in

the South enjoy over the Catholics is, of course, the reason for the widespread intolerance and bigotry in this section of the country. Whatever the Catholics may do or may desire to do, the Protestants, in the very nature of things, may be depended upon to oppose. It should be remembered that the Catholics in America still cling to the political philosophy they entertained when they obtained religious freedom in Maryland in the seventeenth century. Maryland was the pivot from which they worked, so that when they invaded other sections of the country they carried the Maryland tradition with them. The result is that in the South, as elsewhere, the Catholics not only are strong advocates of the separation of the Church and the State, but they support intellectual freedom as well. Consequently they are friendly to the Jews and all alien peoples; they are not opposed to indulgence in pleasures and amusements on the Sabbath.

Being in the minority in the South,—there are only a little more than 200,000 of them outside Louisiana and Texas, against approximately 7,000,000 Protestants,—their views are of course attacked, and suppressed, when possible, by the Protestants.

Educated Protestant ministers secretly recognize the fact that evolution means nothing one way or the other in so far as the efficacy of Christianity is concerned. Sunday blue laws are favored by the Protestants; and the enforced reading of the Bible in the schools is advocated because the Protestants know it is displeasing to the Catholics—as it is to all Americans who have a regard for their Constitutional freedom.

I cannot refrain from stating here that the very term Protestantism is a symbol of bigotry. It is the outgrowth of an opposition to a man-made institution. I dare say if the Christ Himself is peeping through the cloud rifts at some of his so-called followers in this land of ours to-day, He is even more melancholy than He was when one of His disciples betrayed Him and another denied Him. He would see a strange banner floating from the steeples that have been created in His name, and that banner bears the inscription, "Protestantism." It is the symbol of protest against an iniquity that lies in the dust of past centuries, when it should stand for the brotherly love which the followers at Antioch had in their hearts when they coined the term "Christian."

But I am digressing. The territory which is called the "Bible Belt" actually cares little or nothing for the Bible and what it teaches. I base this assertion on *prima facie* evidence. I have noted above how all the laws of man and God are broken by the gentry who pleasantly have been termed "yokels" by the comedians in the pseudo-intellentsia circles. It must not be forgotten that there are something like 25,000,000 people in the States which at one time formed the Confederacy. The number of church members, however, is 9,000,000, or more than one-third of the total population. When the number of so-called church members who do not attend church, but merely pay the dues and receive the annual visits of the brethren, is considered, it is reasonable to believe that less than one-third of the people in the South see the inside of a church from year to year. But, nevertheless, it cannot be

denied that these people—that is, the Protestant portion of them—are influenced more or less by the shoutings and antics of the pulpiteers. And when I say influenced, I do not mean influenced in the matter of Christianity, but in the matter of intolerance.

As a result of what may be called the extra-Christian work of the shouters, pulpiteers, evangelists, reformers, et cetera, the South unfortunately has become conspicuous in movements that are based upon bigotry and intolerance. Forty years ago a Jewish immigrant, unable to speak English, got on a train which he believed was bound for Pittsburgh. The immigration authorities had placed a tag in the lapel of his coat upon which the name of the Pennsylvania city was inscribed. Through a trainman's oversight, the poor fellow arrived in Petersburg, Virginia. Undaunted, however, he established there a small merchandising stand. In a few years he owned a store, and in a few more years his sons were operating one of the largest department stores in Richmond. The man's experience was heralded to Jewry in other lands and the Jews began casting their eyes on the South as a place of potential self-enrichment. But the Jews were timid, so they did not invade the South in large groups. An individual or a family or two would locate in a town or city, and inevitably they would prosper. In one small town in the South, it is said, a Jew was denied the right to locate. "We don't allow Jews here," the mayor said. "I see," said the Jew, "so that's the reason you're still a village!" Catholics and Episcopalians, however, were friendly to the few Jews who located in the South, but the dominant

Protestant groups,—the Methodists and Baptists,—being advised by their spiritual leaders that Jews were "Christ-killers," looked upon them with open dislike. It was enough for the Jews to prosper right under their noses, without affording the added insult of being the descendants of the murderers of the Christ. So it came about that the Protestant brethren took up their assaults on three fronts: the Catholics, the Negroes, and finally the Jews. From pulpit and hillside the word was thrown out that if these three groups of undesirables were not suppressed and driven out, if such a thing were possible, the South would fall prey to their machinations,—to the demoniacal reign of the Pope, to the non-Christian heathenism of the Jews and to the electoral and social equality of the Negro. Hence, the organization in 1915 of the neo-Ku Klux Klan, membership in which cost the strong young men of the land \$10.00 a head. This new movement of the Klan was the direct result of the extra-Christian campaigning of the so-called Christian brethren in the Methodist and Baptist ranks.

I have described what are the general religious,—or is it the non-religious?—tendencies of the Southern people. But I cannot go further without confessing that in all the churches in the South, Catholic and Protestant alike, there are some real Christian men and women who are trying earnestly to uphold the essential tenets of their faith. They are, of course, faced with fearful difficulties. They are in an unfortunate minority. Then, too, there are faithful church members who deal out what they believe to be Christian charity with their left hands while

waving the flag of intolerance with their right. In and out of the churches there is a growing number of intelligent men and women in the South who are fighting religious ignorance and intolerance. It was the fashion some years ago for such people to flee to other lands where one could indulge in intellectual freedom and where one could worship as one desired unmolested. But in the present generation of young people in the South are to be found brave spirits who are staying among their people and trying to show them the sophistry of their Protestant teachers. Such people usually are to be found in the higher institutions of learning and at the editorial desks of the newspapers. The University of Virginia, the University of North Carolina and Tulane University are glowing examples of the liberalism which undoubtedly will guide the South to the heights of understanding and real freedom. Such newspapers as the *Columbus, Ga., Enquirer-Sun*, the *Virginian-Pilot*, of Norfolk, Virginia, which, by the way, is edited by a brilliant young Jew, a native of North Carolina, the *Columbia, S. C., Record*, the *Birmingham, Ala., News*, the *Houston, Texas, Post-Dispatch*, and a half dozen others are waging a convincing fight against the heathenish idols which the Protestant leaders have set up to be worshiped by their people. There are also in the Protestant churches themselves some groups of the present generation who are rebelling against the old intolerance. An example is the fight of the liberal wing of the Virginia Baptists recently against a proposed anti-evolution law in that State. These same Baptists also cried down Protestant opposition in the city of Rich-

mond to the erection of a statue to Christopher Columbus. The Protestants, it seems, opposed the statue because Columbus was a Catholic. In recent years more encouragement has been given by certain groups of Protestants to the Negroes in their efforts to obtain an education. Interracial activities, designed to improve the welfare of the Negroes and to create better feeling between the blacks and whites has been promoted by prominent churchmen and laymen in the Episcopal and Baptist churches. Jews are being received in more brotherly fashion,—although it must be confessed that the social contacts between the Jews and the Gentiles in the South thus far are confined, more or less, to business transactions. Some of the ablest city officials and administrative heads of business groups in the South, however, are Jews. Their financial genius and business foresight in many of the progressive cities in the South have had much to do with the economic welfare of the communities in which they live.

Tolerance is showing its youthful head above the mire of intolerance in the South, so naturally shots are being fired at the head from many Protestant directions, and with added desperation. If the Kingdom is to come as some of the brethren profess to desire in their pulpit musings, there are thousands in the Southland yet who do not want to see it come in the form of a triumph over their valiant teachings. So they humanly and naturally continue their work of broadcasting against the Devil, the Pope, the Monkey and the Yankee.

The Methodists and Baptists, with the strongest flair

for evangelism of any of the Protestant denominations, even before the Civil War gave much attention to the religious training of the Negro, and because of the simplicity of their worship Negroes flocked into the Methodist and Baptist churches by droves. It soon was found necessary to establish Negro churches in these denominations, and to-day every city and town of any consequence has from two to four Colored Methodist and Baptist churches. They are under the spiritual guidance of Negro ministers of varying types. Some of them are well-educated, level-minded and appear to be filled with real Christianity. There was the famous Reverend Jasper of Richmond, Virginia, who in a sermon uttered the heroic statement that "de sun do move." And there was the African orator named Taylor, who at a Negro funeral laid down the excellent theory "dat life ain't nuthin', brudders an' sisters, but addin' and subtractin',—an' hyar, folks, is a mos' woeful case o' subtractin'!" Such pulpiteers usually were harmless enough, and sometimes exerted a real spiritual influence over their people.

But there is in the present generation of Negro ministers in the South a sinister tendency, which has served as a boomerang for their white Methodist and Baptist religious sponsors. It is the poisoning of the minds of the new generation of Negroes against the white people. Some of the Negro pulpits in the South have become hotbeds of anti-white sentiment, where anything from social equality to revolution is preached. The result is that bad feeling has been fostered, and is being fostered between

the blacks and whites in a more far-reaching fashion than many of the white people realize.

In considering the influence of the Protestant churches on the people of the Southern States, it must be remembered that Article VI of the Federal Constitution, which declares that, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," and the First Amendment, which provides that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," apply only to the National Government. No restrictions are placed on the States, and they may, as some of the Southern States have done, exclude from public office any one who denies the existence of a Supreme Being. Tennessee, in addition to prohibiting the teaching of evolution in her public schools, as contrary to belief in divine creation, holds as ineligible for public office a man who does not believe in God and in a future state of rewards and punishments. And Arkansas makes such a man ineligible for jury service. So in a country which is enclosed within unmistakable walls of sectionalism, as the South has been since the Civil War, and possessed of an overwhelming Protestantism, it is not surprising that the Southern States are conspicuous for social and religious movements that are colored with fundamentalism, bigotry and intolerance.

Although the Civil War settled for all time the question of State sovereignty in so far as it pertained to the philosophy that a State might, at will, secede from the

Union, the conflict did not destroy the doctrine of States' rights. This doctrine, which has been weakened by the tendency in the last decade or two to create a Federal bureaucracy, was never better illustrated than in the South where the States, under the compulsion of the Protestants, apply an uncontrolled discretion to the passing of laws and the laying down of rules that apply to human conduct and human beliefs. The strange thing in the South, however, is that Protestantism, not content with placing inhibitions on the States through the privilege of States' rights, has sought vigorously, and in some incidences succeeded, in extending these restrictions to the Federal sphere. The example of a successful effort in this regard was the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment and the passage by Congress of the Volstead enforcement act. The proposed Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution was an example of Protestantism's failure to do the same kind of thing. In 1925 a Congressman from Georgia and another from Tennessee drafted a Federal anti-evolution bill, but no action was taken on it, and nothing ever came of it. Other similar efforts have been made by Southern representatives, urged on by their spiritual leaders, to regulate the morals and beliefs of the American people by Constitutional amendments and legislative enactments.

But, these things being true, the amazing thing about the South is that the people, as I have suggested above, are not a great deal interested in the social and intellectual reforms that their spiritual advisers project, unless the proposed reforms are predicated upon the theory that

the Northern heathens be barred from their borders or, if possible, be regulated in their own lairs. The people care nothing for fundamentalism as such. They care nothing for social reforms as such. The truth is they secretly dislike inhibitions. Nowadays Methodist and Baptist laymen openly violate the church decrees against dancing, playing cards and theater-going, and many of the ministers in the two churches are looking upon these things with liberal eyes. But I dare say if the brethren believed for a moment that they could make their people think that dancing, cards, and theaters were machinations of the Pope and the Yankee, they could sway many of them into believing that these three harmless forms of amusement were as sinister as they have made them believe the theory of evolution to be.

All circumstances considered, the transcendent truth about the South's religious life is that the Southern people are not unlike the Northern or Eastern or Western people. They are good and bad in the same measure. They violate the Ten Commandments, but in no greater degree than peoples in other sections of the country violate them. They disobey the Federal and State laws, but in no greater measure than their neighbors north of the Mason and Dixon line disobey them. There are Southern church members just as intelligent as the church members in other sections. By the same token the North, the East and the West are possessed of church members who are just as ignorant,—and just as intolerant,—as those in the South. So it is that the Southern religionists are not unlike the religionists in other parts of the country

in most things. The differences, of course, lie in the overwhelming number of Protestants in the South, the very marked sectionalism, and the unwavering loyalty to one political faith.

As the people of the South become more educated, and as the modern methods of communication and transportation bring them closer and closer to other sections of the country, they will, in their religious attitudes and conduct and beliefs become more and more like other Americans. I believe it is only fair to say of the Southern religionists as a whole that in spite of the mental and social intolerances they display they have been and are now as clean in their minds and hearts, on the whole, as the people of any other section of the country, and much cleaner than some peoples north of the Mason and Dixon line whose wrong-doings constantly are filling the columns of the daily newspapers. I do not know whether it is the result of home training, the influence of the churches or the climate, but the Southern people are the most warm-hearted and the best-mannered people, on the whole, that I have ever seen anywhere in America. They should not, therefore, be judged too harshly for some of their apparent beliefs or for their reform movements and legislative enactments, because, after all, these things are but symptomatic of the desperate efforts of the brethren of the cloth to bring in a Kingdom which I dare say would startle them out of their boots if it actually should come as they have prayed.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ONE LAW

One of the most amazing moral and social phenomena in modern times is the persistency with which the Protestant churches in America, and particularly those in the South, have agitated, supported and forced the passage of laws prohibiting the making, selling and drinking of intoxicating liquors as beverages, when they not only have nothing in their infallible Book to uphold their philosophy but instead have evidence that the Founder of Christianity Himself used wine and miraculously made it. When I say this I realize that some churchmen will argue that they do not base their support of prohibition upon the Gospels, but upon economic and ethical grounds, but if that were entirely true, why have the Methodists and Baptists interwoven the theory of prohibition into their religious fabrics and made it an organic part of their religious lives as if it were of equal or of more importance than the doctrine of love itself?

If I understand the true meaning of Christianity, it is predicated, above all, upon love for one's God and for one's fellow man. And if I understand the true meaning of temperance it has, in so far as the "divinely inspired" Book of the Protestants is concerned, nothing to do with moderation in the use of intoxicating drinks, much less total abstinence from them, but with self-control or

command over all appetites and passions, mental or bodily, including the regulation of thought, speech and behavior. I make these assertions by way of coming to the subject of prohibition as it pertains to the Southern States. The Southern Protestants, of course, were not solely responsible for the National prohibition laws. Those laws were the result of the very excellent maneuverings of the Anti-Saloon League, which came into being in Ohio. But Southern Protestantism gave the Anti-Saloon League its greatest impetus and support by forcing through State-wide prohibition enactments before the Federal law was projected.

In 1910 the Southern Protestants, as the result of active campaigns in which the "Face on the Bar-room Floor" and "Where is My Wandering Boy To-night" were the battle hymns, had succeeded in having adopted State-wide prohibition laws in five States in the South—North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee,—and by 1914 the movement had spread so successfully that similar laws were passed in Virginia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Florida and Texas, and in the border State of Kentucky. It is noteworthy that in Louisiana where the Catholics are in an overwhelming majority over the Protestants, there was no prohibition law; and Louisiana, I might add, ratified the Eighteenth Amendment by but one vote in its Upper House in the summer of 1918.

Before the year 1910 some of the Southern States had experimented with the system of local option. Tennessee applied the system to the whole State, with the exception of five of the larger cities. Arkansas had local option in

fifty-six out of the seventy-five counties; Florida in thirty-five out of forty-six counties; Mississippi in fifty-six out of seventy-seven counties; and North Carolina in seventy out of ninety-seven counties. As far back as the year 1833 the State of Georgia had tried local option, but a few years later gave it up. Before the year 1893 South Carolina had a licensing system which amounted to local option, but in 1893 it adopted a State dispensary system. Under this system, which was not unlike the systems used in the wet provinces of Canada to-day, the State was the sole purveyor of liquor, buying wholesale from the manufacturers and selling retail through dispensaries under public management and only for consumption off the premises.

But what was the result of these liquor laws? The answer is that the experiences of the States that had them should have warned the South against what would happen if the whole country were placed under a liquor ban. In those counties where local option existed, illicit liquor was poured in in large quantities, and in those States where State-wide prohibition existed, there was no dearth of illicit drink from the wet States; and as for the cities of Charleston and Columbia under South Carolina's dispensary system, the blind-tigers and speak-easies were to be found upon every corner and down every alley, if the seeker but knew the countersigns.

These experiences, however, were but a phase of the liquor problem. While the counties and States were establishing bans on liquor, the moonshiners back in the mountains and hills, principally those in Virginia, West

Virginia, North Carolina and Kentucky, were making moonshine as nonchalantly as their grandfathers and great-grandfathers before them had made it, and were supplying the thirsty ones in the dry areas with more "corn" than they had ever supplied them with before!

But experience apparently is no teacher of men, particularly later generations of men, and so Southern Protestantism joined the ranks of the Anti-Saloon League and carried the fight to the great Dome in Washington. For once in their lives the brethren in the South put their shoulders alongside the shoulders of the brethren from Ohio and Maine and New York and Illinois and there was a great deal of hell to pay before they got through. Of course when the brethren began their crusade they merely considered it an extra-mural duty, so to speak, but when the laws had been written into the Constitution and on the statute books, they made the drinking of water a part of their ritual and the *sine qua non* of their prayers.

Under the local option and State-wide prohibition laws the advocates of prohibition were faced with a problem that could be solved only in the National legislature, and this was one of the chief reasons why they turned to Washington for action that would affect the nation as a whole. Congress, under the Constitution, controlled interstate commerce, and the Supreme Court had ruled that without the consent of Congress no State could prevent a railway or other carrying agency from bringing liquor to any point within its borders from outside. This left the dry States in the rôle more or less of Canutes trying to keep the luscious tides from deluging the unworthy drink-

ers in their commonwealths, so they knew that prohibition would be a hollow mockery unless they spread it over the whole country like a blanket. Little did they realize how much hollower the mockery would be when that had been accomplished!

By this time the philosophy of temperance as it is written in the New Testament (Acts xxiv. 25; Gal. v. 23 and 2 Peter i. 6) evolved into a philosophy of temperance which applied solely to the problem of liquor drinking. The good brethren forgot,—or else they didn't care,—that the infallible Bible does not forbid the use of intoxicants, and made a march on the nation's Capital in behalf of prohibition with even more zeal than they would have carried palms to Jerusalem. They had made efforts to prevent drinking through preaching Christian love and charity; they had, in some cases, exacted pledges from hard drinkers not to touch another drop and they had exhorted with threats of hell-fire; but none of these things had done any good, so they would save the sinners and prevent others,—some yet unborn,—from acquiring the drink habit by passing prohibition laws.

In their forgetfulness of the real purposes of Christianity they overlooked a fundamental truth which has applied to government and legislation since the dawn of civilization. That is that such laws cannot be enforced without a general sentiment in their favor, and that if such a sentiment really exists in the hearts of men, and not superficially as the result of pulpit oratory, then there is no need of such laws. The gleam of reform had dazzled them and blinded them, and in their zeal they

established an institution which has done more to destroy the finer things of the old South than Yankee batteries or the guns of the abolitionists could have done in a hundred years.

But whether or not the Protestants in the South were right or wrong in principle concerning the issue of prohibition, two truths must be recognized. One is that instead of weakening in their stand on prohibition, the Southern voters are as dry, if not dryer, in so far as their ballots are concerned than they were when the theory of prohibition first invaded the territory in the old State-wide and county option days. The other is that economically prohibition has wrought some good in the smaller towns in the South and in the rural districts and in the industries. It would be idle to deny this much as I oppose the whole theory of prohibition.

It is not amiss here to review the National legislation and the part the South played in it. When the Eighteenth Amendment came up for ratification, forty-six of the forty-eight States, including all the Southern States, ratified it. Connecticut and Rhode Island, proverbial Protestants against changes in the organic law, were the only States that did not go on record as being for or against it. That was in the year 1919, and eight years have passed, up to this writing. It is noteworthy that the four Congresses that have been elected during the eight-year period have grown dryer and dryer, in spite of what the anti-prohibitionists have predicted and asserted. In each succeeding session, measure after measure pertaining to prohibition and its more rigid enforcement have

been put through successfully. The wet vote in the two houses has never been more than 20 per cent., and usually it has been 10 per cent. Unquestionably this alignment means that the majority of the country's electorate have placed themselves on the dry side by electing dry Congressmen. And in the South, where the Democrats are in the ascendancy, it never occurs to the politicians to nominate a wet candidate. They know he could never be elected, because they know that whatever the personal sentiments of the voters may be concerning prohibition they invariably will vote dry. The hardest drinker who has no difficulty in getting all the illicit liquor his cellar and gullet will hold, goes upon the theory that, "after all, when it comes to the pinch, brother, I don't want to do anything that might make it possible for the saloons to come back." The inconsistency of such a statement, of course, lies in the fact that in the large cities in the South saloons are still operating for those who know the countersign, while the moonshiners continue to furnish their old-time products in even larger quantities than they did in the days before National prohibition. The dry voter who is wet personally offers a modern political phenomenon; and so long as he exists there will be no successful outspoken wet statesman in the Southern States. The Protestant brethren have a right to feel proud for that much.

Dealers in illicit liquor in the South, like those in the North, are not in the business for their health. They are looking for profits, and because the risk is great they charge handsome prices for their goods. The result is

that farm hands and small farmers in the rural districts and small towns are unable to pay the prices asked for "bootleg," and therefore leave it alone. The same thing is true of men working on small wages in the South's industrial plants. Many of the farmers, however, make cider, and the workers in the city concoct home brews, but generally speaking, there is less drinking among these two groups, compared with the drinking a decade or two ago.

In the cities of the South conditions are not unlike those in the large urban centers in the North and East. The children of the man who used to come home and beat his wife and failed to provide shoes for his offspring are now carrying hip flasks while father soberly brings in the bacon. One of the glaring evils of prohibition is the way in which it has made tipplers of boys and girls of high school age in a section of the country where the people at one time prided themselves on the purity of home life and on the good manners and deference of the youngsters. Boys and girls nowadays have taken up the art of petting and drinking to a degree that makes some sociologists fear for the future. In the homes of the middle class and the well to do, the drinking,—and sometimes the petting,—is indulged in by the elder people too, so that in a Southern home to-day it is not altogether unusual to see cocktails served at social gatherings, save perhaps at those held in a parish house or in a Sunday-school building.

Sometimes a city of, say, from 50,000 to 60,000 people will receive most of its liquor supply from one or two counties surrounding it. A glowing example is the city of Roanoke, Virginia, one of the most progressive towns of

its size in the South. Roanoke county, in which it is situated, is bounded by Franklin, Bedford, Floyd, Montgomery, Botetourt and Craig counties. It would be safe to say that these counties supply half the illicit liquor that is used by the parched-throated gentry in Roanoke, and that half the supply of the counties is provided by Franklin county. Some of the best liquor that enters Roanoke probably comes from Baltimore, Norfolk, and Louisville, Kentucky; but the sturdy sons who "are ready for any fate" and who are willing to drink anything that has alcohol in it, depend on the products that come from the counties. Of course, there are a handful of State and Federal dry agents making raids and clogging up the dockets of the United States District Court, but their work has no more effect on the flood than the levees seem to have had in the Mississippi valley in the spring of 1927. Floyd county at one time was noted for its buckwheat. The hot cakes made from this delightful grain became proverbial in Virginia, and even in lands beyond the seas. But, after the National prohibition laws went into effect, the Floyd county gentry, following the advice of the experts to go in for diversification, have, I understand, gone in for a very profitable business in corn and rye, which it might be added is measured by the quart and not by the bushel.

Norfolk, Virginia, is a port of entry for illicit liquor, as are all the South Atlantic seaports,—Wilmington, Charleston, Mobile, Savannah, and New Orleans on the Gulf. In New Orleans the people have never had any reason for believing that the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead act are on the books. This is because the city

has a large French Catholic population where wine not only is good for the stomach's sake, but where the drinking thereof is looked upon as a gesture of loyalty in memory of sunny France.

The city of Atlanta gets its water supply from the Chattahooche River, above the mouth of Peachtree Creek, fifteen miles distant; but its bootleg supply comes from every hill and stream in a radius of twenty-five miles. Its best liquor, however, comes from Savannah, Mobile and Louisville. The town is a great center for the sale of horses and mules; but the mule that predominates is "white mule." The result is that the Georgia metropolis, anxious to be the "New York of the South," outdoes the Empire City in its wetness, in spite of the fact that it is the see of a Methodist bishop and the headquarters for important Methodist and Baptist institutions of learning. Atlanta is the home of the free and the brave—free drinkers who are brave enough to drink anything with alcohol in it—and they are recruited from the ranks of all classes of the gentry, including the Ku Klux Klan, whose headquarters is in the town, and some of the best of the Protestant groups,—the Methodists, Baptists, and, sad to say, the Presbyterians. It is idle to speak of the Episcopalians, because they simply are divided into two classes: those who oppose prohibition and those who oppose it, but vote dry.

The city of Birmingham also is the headquarters for Methodist and Baptist schools. The town lies between two mountains from which are extracted the ores that go into the making of America's steel products. The lowland between bears the easily remembered name Jones Valley. But ores are not the only things that are ex-

tracted from the near-by mountains. Thousands of the Joneses in the valley are supplied with liquor, therefrom. But the city also is possessed of fastidious drinkers who get their stuff from Mobile and Louisville, considering it to be the *de luxe* of the alcoholic world. Among the young people and many of the elders in the Alabama city is the same modern spirit that marks the large cities in the North. Hip flasks are the symbols of "good sports," and the bridge gathering that bears no witness to cocktails is considered old-fashioned and distasteful. But it cannot be denied that the workers in the furnaces and steel mills in and around the city are a sober lot because their wages won't permit them to pay the prevailing bootleg prices—nor have they the money to go to Mobile, Louisville or Canada, as the case may be, for the sole purpose of drinking.

It is interesting to consider the town of Montgomery, Alabama, in the center of the South's "cotton belt." There was a time when its chief industries had to do with the manufacture of fertilizers, machine-shop products, cotton goods, lumber products, cigars, harness, stoneware, bricks,—and, God save their Protestant souls, beer! From last accounts these industries, including beer, with rye and corn added in abundance, are still the life of the town. This place was the "cradle of the Confederacy" until May, 1861, when the capital of the Confederate States was removed to Richmond. There probably is no drier community in the South politically than Montgomery—nor is there actually a wetter one, in point of population and consumption.

Richmond, the Capital of the Confederacy through the

Civil War, may be termed the heart of the South in so far as the Southern traditions and memories are concerned, although Nashville, Tennessee, keeps alive the spirit of the old South in almost as great a degree. In Richmond are to be found the sees of two Protestant bishops and one Catholic bishop. In addition it has three or four Baptist institutions of learning and a Presbyterian theological seminary. Several Protestant religious weeklies are printed there. The whole atmosphere is soaked in an aura of purity and holiness. But, the manufacture of cigars, cigarettes, chewing tobacco and snuff being the chief industry, that aura is a little mixed with tobacco smoke. I mention this because some good Americans consider tobacco as great an evil as liquor, and it will be remembered that in Kansas and Utah the dreadful weed was prohibited—for a time. But, strange to say, smoking is not a sin in Richmond. Some of her bishops and ministers smoke, holding that the indulgence is good for the mind and body. But from Richmond the philosophy is broadcast that liquor and the drinking thereof are sinful, and this philosophy is supported by a powerful hierarchy, including the Protestant leaders and a State Anti-Saloon League whose edicts are feared by candidates and politicians as greatly as the ancients feared the thunder of Jove.

But, alas, Richmond drinks; she drinks hard and she drinks freely. To make a long story short the heart of the old South is not always a sober heart; and there probably is no town in America of Richmond's size which can boast of more gulping of intoxicants nor more arrests

for drunkenness per annum. There, as in other Southern communities, the voters line up at the polling places and respond to the orders of the dry hierarchy by voting dry—but with equal zeal they line up at social functions, at the clubs, at “home parties” and indulge in the pastime of swallowing fluid that makes them dizzy.

In so far as the Protestant hierarchy’s attitude toward the prohibition problem in the South is concerned, the hierarchy is not unlike the sailor who was stranded on the one-acre island and thought he had landed on a continent. But that is merely an attitude. Every man, woman and child in the South knows that prohibition there is, save in the case of certain citizens in the rural sections and in the industries, a farce and a failure. Perhaps the time will come when the Southern people will face the facts honestly, and when the brethren will learn that prohibition is not a *sine qua non* of Christianity, but that day will never come so long as the men and women who are personally opposed to prohibition and drink what, when and how they please, go to the polls and vote dry. If such people would express their real views publicly, and transcribe these views upon the ballot, it would be a signal to the politicians to clamber down from the water wagon and jump into the bootlegger’s truck. In any event, the wet-dry voter in the South is a political phenomenon that is second in interest and importance only to the Christian brother who believes that Christ died on the Cross to save sinners from drinking themselves to death, and for that alone.

CHAPTER IX

SOCIAL CONDITIONS

It often has been said that history repeats itself; and no better illustration of this is to be found than in the aims and purposes of Protestantism. For example, in the Middle Ages the Catholic Church's casuistry by which it laid down laws that governed the beliefs and conducts of its people and exacted of them a blind faith, and against which the Protestants finally turned, is repeated in America to-day by the Protestant churches themselves in their insistence upon such legislation as the prohibition and anti-evolution laws, and in the insistence that the Bible shall be read in the public schools. It probably is unfair to say that the Protestants are trying to establish a state church, but it cannot be denied that the manner in which they are trying to regulate human conduct and human thinking, in effect, amounts to the same thing.

But, while these things unfortunately are true, this much must be said of the Southern Protestants as compared with Protestants in other sections of the country; they have wrought as much good; they have maintained just as high standards of living; they have produced as many genuinely fine men and women; and they have also produced what are probably as sincere and self-sacrificing brethren of the cloth as have been produced per 1,000 population in any other section of America. No man

can honestly discuss Protestantism in the South without admitting these facts. So, when the stultifying stands that Protestantism in the South has taken on such matters as prohibition, evolution and other prohibitive measures, like the bans on theaters, cards and dancing, have been discounted, Southern Protestantism stands out to-day, in my opinion, as the leader of American Protestants in their efforts to lift society to a higher plane. It will be said by some, of course, that this does not mean a great deal because Protestantism throughout America has failed and is continuing to fail. However that may be, I stick to my contention.

One of the finest influences which the Methodist and Baptist churches exert in the South is among the children. Their Sunday schools are unsurpassed in the country for character-building. Little children, it should be remembered, are too young to become involved in the evils of drink or to be in danger of hell-fire from delving into books on the theory of evolution. The Methodists and Baptists have a way of making the Gospel stories interesting for them where the Episcopalians and Presbyterians fail. I must confess that I do not know why this is. The Episcopalians and Presbyterians belong to the more intellectual groups of religion, and the Episcopalians, particularly, are rated as among the stiffest and coldest religionists we have in the land to-day. These qualities may have something to do with their failure to interest and train the children in the Sunday schools. I have been told that the Methodist and Baptist men's Bible classes and Sunday-school pupils are taught by especially

trained men and women, whereas the Episcopalians and Presbyterians do not indulge in intensive training for their teachers.

The Methodist and Baptists, although no more generous-hearted than the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, deal out charity in larger quantities and in more different ways. They have more orphanages; they have more homes for the aged; and they have more and better educational institutions than their fellow Protestants. Some of the finest colleges in the South are sponsored by them; although it must be said that the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., which is sponsored by the Episcopal church, and Hampden-Sidney, of Virginia, sponsored by the Presbyterians, are among the finest in the land.

There are among the Methodist and Baptist laymen in the South some of the leading citizens in that section of the country who, having made their success, give largely of their time and money to philanthropic work and to that branch of church work which has to do with social service. In no section of the country to-day is there a wider range of activities designed to improve and benefit mankind among churches than in the South to-day. In the mountains of Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, West Virginia and Tennessee, extensive church missions and training schools have been established for the ignorant mountaineers. A notable mission work is that of the Blue Ridge missions, forty in number, in the Diocese of Virginia of the Protestant Episcopal church. The first of these, was established by Dr. Frederick W. Neve, an Englishman, thirty years ago. To-day a mission home

and training school are being operated within a day's walk of the University of Virginia at Charlottesville.

The great range of activities of the Protestant churches in the South, together with their foreign mission work, should be enough to shame their brethren in the North who speak of them as doing nothing but chanting hymns and performing acrobatic stunts in their pulpits. In the Spring of 1927, in a Presbyterian church in Philadelphia, a policeman was called in to quell a riot because the pastor had been accused of kissing some of the comely members of his flock. A few weeks later when the pastor of a Baptist church in Philadelphia undertook to defend a Roman Catholic aspirant for the Presidency, fifty members of his flock walked out on him, and the pastor requested his organist to play a funeral march. In no church in the South, not even in one of the Holy Roller variety, have I heard of such displays of impropriety.

Northern critics of the Protestant churches in the South have specified their intolerance in the matter of the Catholics, prohibition, evolution, et cetera, but I have seen none who has been fair enough to point to the widespread social service which has demanded their time and money. And, as I have said, this has had good results. There is a definite refining influence for children in the homes. I must confess that when they reach the high school age they get away from much of this and emulate their Northern brothers and sisters in the practice of petting and carrying hip flasks.

The Southern woman provides one of the fine refreshing hopes for a better civilization in her beauty, her

charm, her integrity, her loyalty and her ability to influence into ways of right living those who come within her circle. I dare say the Southern mother of this type has done more than any other factor to keep alive the finer traditions of the old South. But the Southern woman, like the women of America generally, has changed in many ways. In the measure in which the South has traveled from the crinoline to the short skirt and from the pompadour to the bob, so has the woman of the South traveled; but I must say this much for her: she is not as greatly influenced by the feminist movement as her Northern sister, and the masculine type of woman in the South is rare. Economic conditions, the ever changing things that enter into what we call industrial and commercial progress have had less effect on the true woman of the South than on the women in other sections of America. But this does not mean that she has not gone somewhat along with the tide. The Southern woman is just as addicted to the "club idea" as her Northern sister.

The contrast which time has wrought is to be found by reviewing the evolution of the Southern woman since the Civil War. During the war a benefit performance for the wounded soldiers was being given in a small Virginia town. The daughter of an aristocratic plantation owner was asked to take part in it. Her father refused to let her do it upon the ground that "ladies do not make public appearances." This gentleman's wife upon a Sunday rode to church in an old fashioned hack. The hack door became locked in some unknown manner, and when the lady arrived at church she found that she couldn't get

out of the hack because she wore hoop skirts, so she sat in the vehicle in front of the church and followed the service. Southern ladies nowadays do not hesitate to give their services to any worthy cause, as the World War period disclosed, whether it is to cheer up soldiers, to whom they have never been introduced, or whether they are asked to knit socks. And as for getting out of the modern hack,—which may be a Ford or a Rolls-Royce,—the Southern lady of to-day is probably more agile than her Northern sister.

The Southern woman, of course, goes in for all the latest fashions and fads, but she does so more cautiously than the woman of the North. A New York newspaper man who visited the city of Richmond in the Spring of 1927 remarked how the skirts of the women he saw on the street there were from two to three inches longer than those worn by the New York women. But had he gone to a meeting of the local League of Women Voters or to a conference of the State Federation of Women's Clubs he would have seen the women doing just as they would do in New York, in Pennsylvania or Massachusetts.

Until the year 1900 ladies in the South were not supposed to paint or black their eyebrows, although even the most genteel of them resorted to the faintest of perfumes and powders. Southern fathers considered painting and eyebrow blacking to be a vulgar art confined to actors and actresses—and to the women of the street. After 1900 a change came, and it was not many years before a man had difficulty in determining who was and who was not painted among the women he knew.

For a period of twenty years after the Civil War a gentleman in Virginia or South Carolina might be seen rising to his feet and bowing when a lady passed by his house, although the sidewalk on which she journeyed might be fifty or seventy-five feet distant. A Virginia or South Carolina gentleman would no more think of doing such a thing to-day than a business man would think of rising from his chair every time his stenographer comes into his office. In many cities of the South gentlemen's hats are removed even in business elevators when women are present. This custom which has died out altogether in the North gradually is disappearing in the South.

Before 1900 young ladies were rarely ever permitted out after dark without escorts, and in Charleston and Richmond this custom is still followed, more or less, but in the South generally, especially among the younger generation, women and girls walk about the streets as freely and readily as men. One of the most painful sights that greets the eyes of an old Southerner is to see young girls loafing at cigar and drug store corners day or night in the same fashion that young men loafed at such places twenty-five or thirty years ago. Such girls often may be members of the leading families of the community.

The automobile has brought unfavorable developments to the South just as it has to other sections of America. Joy rides are not infrequent, and have disastrous effects. Girls from the best families participate in these adventures, the principal features of which are petting, using the contents of hip flasks and patronizing roadhouses. The widespread indulgence in joy rides, I

dare say, is one of the results of the destruction of the red-light districts in the cities of the South a few years prior to and during the World War. This movement swept the country and the South carried it out probably more rigidly than the cities of the North. The result is that the ancient trade is carried on in automobiles and assignation houses and that the scarlet woman often is found residing in the best neighborhoods. This age-old problem, of course, never has been solved satisfactorily, and probably never will be. So desperate have the good people in some communities in the South become over the situation, that in one important city, I am told, the ministers held a secret meeting and recommended that the red-light district, under rigid medical supervision and regulation, be reestablished. It is doubtful, however, that the red-light districts will ever come into being again. Even those persons who might favor them as being the lesser of two evils find the plan too repugnant and revolting to sanction. In any event, the problem is one which is giving the Southern States even more concern possibly than the Northern commonwealths, because the Protestants in the South take the matter far more seriously.

One noticeable thing about Southern society since the year 1900 is the ascendancy in nearly all activities, business and social alike, of the middle class of fifty years ago and the newly rich. Citizens from these two groups make up the business and social leadership in most of the communities, and have forced the aristocrats and blue bloods to step aside. This, however, is nothing more than history repeating itself, and probably is as it should be. When

one remembers the Cromwellian era and how peers were made of peasants, and going back to the ancient Greek and Roman days to how the lower classes ultimately swept over the patricians, or to the French Revolution, or to the Russian Revolution in modern times, one has no right to be surprised at the bloodless social revolutions that go on from time to time in America. In the South such a situation is as it should be for more reasons than one, but one important justification is that those persons who belong to what were aristocratic families of fifty years ago, for various reasons have failed to maintain their traditions, or they have been unable economically or otherwise to meet the changing times. Fortunately, in the new ranks, are to be found some of the best types of modern manhood and womanhood, due partly to their intermarriage with the best bloods. Notable exceptions to these changes are to be found in Richmond and Charleston, where the blue bloods not only are as exclusive as they were half a century ago, but where they still maintain a business and social leadership.

The feminist movement which has swept America, of course, has made many changes in the South. One of the saddest for the Southerner who is sentimentally inclined, is the way in which the women themselves slowly but surely have destroyed chivalry in men and eliminated from their relationships anything resembling the old-time romance. There was a day when the young swain would write verse to his lady, in the Byronic temper, or after the fashion of Scott, Shelley, or Keats. If a youth seriously were to present such stanzas to his girl friend

to-day, he would be the object of her heartiest laughter. I confess that he probably would deserve it, because Southern young men and women, like young men and women of the age everywhere, have adopted more substantial attitudes toward each other. While there probably is more tenderness, even some romance in comparison, between the sexes in the South than in the North, the frankness and lack of convention which exist between boys and girls in the North also is to be found in the South—and, no doubt, it is fortunate, when modern social conditions are considered. Southern girls before 1900 were told by their fathers and brothers to stay at home and knit and look pretty, and were not allowed to make their own living. All that has changed. The business woman, or the business girl, is almost as prevalent in the South as she is in the North. When she first appeared men were skeptical, but gradually she is being recognized, and in some communities women are in business and professional posts of the highest responsibility.

Southern communities fortunately are not as harassed with the housing problem as Northern cities. The towns of the South, of course, have their Negro sections where poverty and squalor are found to the *n*th degree, but generally speaking the white populations fare from thirty to forty per cent. better than the whites in the cities of the North, particularly in the metropolitan sections. There are no tenements in the South, save in the Negro quarters. In the industrial towns in the South many of the large corporations provide the most modern living quarters and facilities for their employees, and nothing is

wanting in sanitation and healthful surroundings. One thing which, however, has been felt more keenly in the South by the housewives than by those of the North is the servant problem. This applies to rural as well as to urban communities. The economic conditions of the Negro in the South gradually are improving from year to year as the result of education, and often the educated ones establish businesses of their own, or the male members of the households are able to provide for the family and prevent the women from "hiring out." The result is that Negro cooks, housemaids and washerwomen are becoming scarcer and scarcer in communities where ten and twenty years ago they were pleading for work. Their new condition has enabled them to be altogether independent, and in some communities they have established what amount to union codes regarding pay and working hours. I am told that in the city of Norfolk, Virginia, soon after the close of the World War a group of Negro women organized, fixed their pay and working hours and established what they called a "black list." On this list were the names of white housewives who in their opinion had mistreated cooks, maids and washerwomen in various ways, and no Negress in the organization was expected to hire out to any person so listed. The organization, however, did not last long because the Negresses would hire out secretly at almost any wage in time of economic depression.

Inasmuch as the white woman of the South for so many years depended upon Negro servant help, the want of servants has provided a real hardship, particularly for the

older generation of women. Nowadays, the urban Southerners resort to apartment life in a degree that almost equals the urban dwellers of the North. Only the wealthy Southerners can afford large homes and a retinue of servants. The younger generation of married couples has learned to do without servants, entirely in some cases. This has developed a new species of Southern gentleman—the man who helps his wife to do the housework, including the hanging out of washing, the scrubbing of floors, bathing babies and going to market. The cavalier of war days and reconstruction days knew less about such things than the average mountaineer knows about Tammany Hall, but the modern Southern husband can give the Northern husbands who even before the Civil War helped his wife with the housework, a run for his money.

The South has its pauperism, but it is far from being like it was during and immediately after the Civil War. It is noteworthy that the members of many of the old aristocratic families are improvident in money and business matters. The women were never taught to be business-like, many of them never handling money until they were adults, and the men, only too often, were never taught the value of a dollar, the idea seeming to be, until about the year 1900, that a blue-blooded Southern gentleman must give his thought to being a gentleman and a scholar and not to the very important matter of meeting grocery bills and paying taxes. Such an attitude has brought tragedy to more than one old Southern family; and while the excuse often is given that the war left them penniless and unable to provide for themselves, it often

has been the case that opportunities to recoup their fortunes and to maintain their economic as well as their social eminence, have been thrust aside by nothing more than downright improvidence.

As a result of the changed economic conditions in the South, including the housing problem, the average Southerner, in spite of the fact that he probably is better off now than he was in 1900 or prior to that time, rarely ever finds himself in the position to extend the proverbial hospitality for which the South once was noted. The matter of hospitality on the old-time scale and in the old-time manner, is confined altogether to the wealthy Southerners. There is probably among them the same warmth and charm that was found in the old Southern homes, but many of these wealthy citizens belong to the newly rich, and do not, as hard as some of them may have tried to learn, know the technique of the old Southern hospitality. The day when a poor relation would come to spend a week and stay six months has passed. The new generation of Southerner doesn't have the patience, nor, perhaps, the love for the poor relation that was extended in the old days, and he or she, as the case may be, soon is informed that the house is crowded and that his or her company would be more respected at a distance.

However, I know of the case of a man in Richmond of moderate means who but a few years ago offered a young medical student, his son's friend, the use of his home while studying medicine in the Virginia capital. The fellow spent four years at the Richmonder's home, did not pay him a cent board, and is now, I understand, a prom-

inent doctor in New York. The Richmonder thought nothing of the matter, and has, I have heard, taken an aged friendless lady, who is no blood kin to him, into his home. This gentleman belongs to the old school, and although there are many men in the South who probably possess his generous impulses, there are few who put them into practice nowadays because of the changed economic conditions.

On large plantations in the South where crops are cultivated and harvested on a large scale or where cattle is raised in large numbers, farming is such as to attract labor, but it must be paid wages almost equal to those paid by industrial plants in the cities. This means that small farmers in the South are well-off without labor, white or black. It also means that the South has been hurt worse than any other section of the country by the migration from farms to cities. Rural life probably is even more attractive than it was a quarter of a century ago. A thrifty, able farmer, with a small farm, which he can operate himself, with the help of one or two hired men, who may be his sons, and with the help of his wife, can live comfortably. He may have an automobile which can travel over good roads to the cities. He may have a private lighting plant, a private water-supply plant, a telephone, a radio, a truck garden, plenty of milk cows, hogs, poultry and other minor means to make farm life content.

But the average small farmer in the South, unfortunately, is not thrifty. He is either too fond of being a "gentleman farmer," after the old manner,—that is to

say, one who prefers watching others do the work while he commands,—or else he is too ignorant and lacking in vision to make a success of his farm. About the year 1900 and for a decade thereafter small Southern farmers were reluctant to adopt modern agricultural methods, but the work of State agricultural departments and their so-called county agents, have brought about a revolutionary change in many of the Southern States. Dairying is being done scientifically; fruit orchards have been developed by scientific means; and scientific methods of farming have been applied to other phases of agricultural work. But, in spite of these things, the farmers in the South have probably been the hardest hit by the labor problem; and the Southerners, of course, suffer along with their brother agriculturists in other sections in the matter of supply and demand. Many of them in the cotton belt are beginning to see the wisdom of diversification, and in many of the States mutually profitable coöperative organizations have been formed with successful results.

At this writing there is developing a "back-to-the-farm" movement in the South, which in time may have gratifying results. It is noticeable, too, that wealthy Southerners, in increasing numbers, are establishing country places. Some of the old colonial mansions are being bought and rebuilt; and the craze for antique furniture and furnishings has struck the South as it has everywhere else. There probably is no more delightful way of living than on an old Southern plantation whose mansion has been rebuilt and modernized and equipped with all the modern conveniences, not to mention such luxuries as

swimming pools, tennis courts, golf links, gun galleries, et cetera. Such a place is a paradise compared with the plantation and its manse of fifty years ago, where all the inconveniences known to rural life were suffered for the sake of maintaining what amounted to a feudal system.

Social conditions in the South, of course, have been influenced by the ever-changing forces that have affected and are continuing to affect the life of America. And, although the South, unfortunately, has lost much of the old-time charm that marked the individuality and home-life of its people, there is still noticeable within its borders an adherence to many of the manners and customs that once identified it as a territory set apart. Gradually the modern means of communication and transportation, the industrial growth and the greater intermingling of the peoples of the South with the people of other sections of America, are removing the old identifying marks. And when they have disappeared entirely, there will be gone a beauty and a spiritual richness which the nation will miss, and as time goes on will probably never be able to recover. The dead rose leaves of the old South still hold a hint of its bygone fragrance, but the time is not far off, perhaps, when these rose leaves will turn to dust.

CHAPTER X

EDUCATION

In the year 1910 there died in the town of Charlottesville, Virginia, at the age of 90 an old gentleman who had been graduated at the University of Virginia, a fine Greek and Latin classical scholar and a man who could quote passages from Shakespeare as readily as some men can pass the time of day. But it was a characteristic of this gentleman for half of his lifetime to use bad English; and he appeared to take pride in the fact. The double negative was one of his pet accomplishments. He probably was an extreme case, but there have been in the South until recent times many educated gentlemen who were more or less like the Charlottesville man.

There always has been in the South a carelessness of speech which has characterized the section. The contraction "ain't," for example, is used by the best educated people; and in North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee and Kentucky the most cultured men and women use the word "come" for came. It is noteworthy that the more cultured people in the South pronounce the well-known word "tomato" with the broad "a." Many persons who use the broad "a" in tomato, however, use it in no other word; and in Virginia and South Carolina only do the cultured people resort to the broad "a" in most of their words. The broad "a" in "tomato" is ridiculed by members of the middle

and lower classes who often suggest that "potato" be pronounced the same way. The users of the broad "a" in "tomato," however, may find comfort in the fact that of the seven leading English dictionaries in the world, five of them give "tomato" with the broad "a" as the preferred pronunciation.

In Virginia and South Carolina where the cultured people use the broad "a" in most of their words, their pronunciation possesses the charm of naturalness. There probably is no affectation more grating than that which embraces the use of the broad "a" by persons who strain themselves to do so.

Some years ago Julian Street made a tour of the more important Southern cities, and in Richmond was entertained by an aristocratic lady of the old school. In a magazine article which appeared a few weeks later he declared complacently that he had heard what he had for years wanted to confirm, namely, the use by a Southerner of the expression, "You all," applied to one person. This particular lady who represented the élite of Southern manners and customs, he averred, had used the expression in addressing him! But Mr. Street must have been nodding. Certainly he must have misunderstood the lady, for "You all" is never resorted to by Southerners in addressing one person. The phrase, which connotes the second person plural of the personal pronoun "you," and which repeatedly is used by Shakespeare, applies to more than one person. The *Louisville Courier-Journal*, discussing the matter editorially in 1922, declared, "That 'you all' is employed by Americans of the Southern States

in addressing a single person is too absurd to deserve refutation." And the Nashville *Banner*, treating of the same subject in an editorial in 1921, said: "Joel Chandler Harris, Thomas Nelson Page, and other Southern writers proficient in the use of Southern dialect have said that they never heard or knew the use of 'you all' in the singular number. It is an allusion, or manner of speech, that Northern listeners don't wholly take in that makes them believe otherwise. 'You all' is the Southern plural for you. Those of the mountains say 'you'uns,' that is, you ones, for the same purpose." So Mr. Street's ears tricked him, and probably if his hostess read his magazine article, nobody was more surprised than she to glimpse his statement concerning her use of "you all."

In Virginia, and particularly in the Eastern part of the State, members of the old aristocratic families still use the terms "cyar" and "cyarpet," for "car" and "carpet" and similar words. The word "girl" is pronounced "gel" as in gelding. These expressions were handed down from those emigrants who came over from England, and particularly those who migrated from Yorkshire. The use of such terms in Virginia to-day, however, is confined more or less to the old generation of the best families. In Eastern Virginia, and in parts of South Carolina the words "how" and "crowd" are pronounced as if the "o" in them were a "u" as in "crude." And in the Carolinas and Alabama the terms "word" and "bird" are pronounced much after the fashion of the East Side New Yorker—"woid" and "boid."

The Southern Negro dialect is probably the outgrowth

of the Negro's ignorance of letters mixed with a certain ear for music. Vocal sound to an illiterate Negro is simply a form of music, and music, in so far as words are concerned for the Negro, is a kind of poetry. Thus we hear the Southern Negro using the articles "dis" and "dat" for "this" and "that," and the word "gwine" for "going." The educated Southern white of to-day probably owes his failure to pronounce the final "g" to the Negroid influence, for the Negroes in the South never pronounce the final "g." Their words are cut and blended in such fashion as to make a language that is peculiarly adaptable to music. The Negro's laugh, loud and more or less musical, is accompanied by a slap on the knee which is but an expression of the inherent rhythm in his soul. Their impulses, of course, are primitive, and if they were allowed to give the freest vent to their impulses they would chant their language rather than speak it. It is noteworthy that the Negro articles, such as "dis" and "dat" are remindful of the Teutonic articles; but the Negro words are not outgrowths of Teutonic influences. They come from a mixture of laziness, ignorance and musical emotion which are a part of the Negroid constitution. Among the so-called "poor whites" in the South the language of the Negro in most of its shades and coloring are to be found. I once asked a Tennessee mountaineer, whose home was on the North Carolina border, in the Big Smoky mountains, the distance from one place to another. "Wal," he said, "Ah rickon yo' ken git thar agin' the sun gone sot." Translated, this meant that he believed I could, by walking, reach the

point mentioned before sundown. It will be noted, however, that he used the word "thar" instead of the Negroid term "dar." This is a notable distinction between the "poor whites" and the Negroes in the South.

Education, although bringing about many gratifying changes in the South, has not improved the language of the Southerners materially. Even those persons who have been educated in the institutions of higher learning, in their social contacts, cling to the Negroid language influences with a remarkable tenacity. But this is far from being a handicap, and I for one would be distressed to see the language formations and customs and manners which have given the South a distinctive charm, disappear in favor of the precise linguists and the disciples of the books of etiquette. Etiquette in the South, by the way, I believe, truly comes from the heart. It is not the outgrowth of written formulæ. If a gentleman in a street car rises and gives his seat to a lady, he doesn't do it because the thing is a part of a formula, but because his heart dictates to him to pay homage to womanhood. And if the time comes when the men of the South cease paying such homage, it will be the fault of the women and not of the men.

In these days of scientific educational methods, the South, along with other sections of the country, has made remarkable strides. I shall not go into dusty statistics, but it is noteworthy that the Southern States during the past two decades have cut down their illiteracy percentages more than any other States in the Union. This probably is due to the fact that they had more illiteracy to reduce.

However that may be, they have kept apace with their Northern neighbors in the use of modern methods. As a result Normal schools, where more efficient teachers are trained, have sprung up in nearly every State in the South. County high schools have been established, and domestic science and manual training are among the courses in at least one high or intermediate school in each Southern city.

Compulsory education has had much to do with reducing illiteracy; but where these laws exist considerable difficulty has been experienced in enforcing them. In the cotton belt and in some of the industrial centers where children of school age are used in the fields and factories, the adults are inclined to wink at the compulsory school laws.

Education in the South is not a new thing by any means. As far back as 1810 the State of South Carolina passed a law providing for the public education of indigent children, and Georgia passed a similar law in 1817. Many Southerners of to-day have probably forgotten the fact, but from the year 1868 to 1875 the State of Alabama provided schools in which whites and blacks were educated together. Such an arrangement was found to be unsuitable and distasteful to the whites in Alabama, so the two races were separated. Now they are separated in all the Southern States. For doing this the Southerners have been hotly attacked in some quarters in the North, but such critics forget that in the South are to be found the country's leading Negro institutions of learning. No finer schools for Negroes are to be found in the Union

than the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, a coeducational institution, at Hampton, Virginia, and Tuskegee Institute, at Tuskegee, Alabama. These schools under wise Negro leadership have trained and are training young Negro men and women for various occupational pursuits for which they are best fitted, and at the same time are striving to inculcate in them a right perspective of their relationships with the whites. One of the chief aims of Booker T. Washington, who founded Tuskegee Institute and headed it for many years, was to promote a better understanding between the whites and blacks. He met with many difficulties from unsympathetic whites in the South and from Negroes in the North who entertained the idea that he was too conservative in his attitude toward the whites. That his philosophy was based upon inherent wisdom, I believe, is proved by an incident that came to my attention in the city of Philadelphia. The head of a Negro welfare organization in that city, in a letter to a leading newspaper there, complained that Negro graduates of the University of Pennsylvania had the utmost difficulty in obtaining the kind of work in Philadelphia or elsewhere in Pennsylvania that their education fitted them to do and were compelled to go into spheres of work that were foreign to their training at the University. The writer of the letter contrasted the experience of the Negroes with that of the white graduates, who, he said, had no difficulty in obtaining work that called for the training which the University gave them. Apparently the best the Northern Negro college and University

graduates can hope for, is to go into the professions and practice them among their own people.

At Hampton and Tuskegee, the training has a two-fold objective: to give the young Negro man or woman a vocation in life and at the same time not encroach upon the social or economic structures of the whites. At Tuskegee cooking schools are operated; farming, trucking, fruit growing, baking and canning are taught. In all, forty different industries are taught at Tuskegee; and Southern people, both whites and blacks, are beginning to see more clearly every year the wisdom of Booker T. Washington's philosophy. Radical Negroes in the North and their white friends, from time to time, have tried to upset the fine work of Hampton and Tuskegee; but the large body of white people in America, whether in the North, South, West or East know instinctively,—or in time, will come to know,—that education for the Negro can never mean that it will be followed by social equality. There is, I dare say, more feeling, among a larger number of white people against such aspirations of the Negro in the North to-day than there is in the South; and the reason is that the Negroes in the Southern institutions of learning are trying earnestly to carry out the sane policies of Washington and of his successor, Major Robert T. Moton, the present head of Tuskegee.

The grammar and high schools and colleges and universities in the South are to-day among the best in the land. Their instructors are better trained than they were ten or twenty years ago,—although, I fear, they are not

as well paid as in the North,—they use modern methods, have the latest kinds of equipment and facilities and are housed in up-to-date buildings. But there is a wide difference between the grammar and high schools on the one hand and the colleges and universities on the other, in the matter of liberalism. This probably is but natural. In any event, the text books in history and biology in some of the Southern States, notably those in Georgia, Texas, Tennessee and Mississippi, are made to order to suit the notions of the people in regard to evolution and the Civil War. In Tennessee and Mississippi legislative enactments prohibit the teaching of evolution in any of the public schools. In Texas the State Textbook Commission adopted a resolution prohibiting such teaching and the same thing was done by the Atlanta Board of Education. In so far as the Civil War histories are concerned, all the Southern States have textbooks, according to blue print. It is a well known fact that textbook publishers publish two different textbooks concerning Civil War histories—one for the North and the other for the South. This is an old issue, and one upon which the Southerners will go to war as quickly as they did when the Stars and Bars first were unfurled more than sixty years ago. The result is that men like Lee, Jackson, Stuart, Jefferson Davis, Beauregard, Johnston, Forrest and others are glorified more than the Revolutionary heroes, including Washington and Jefferson. There is pride in the fact that Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and others of their day were Southerners, but unfortunately they did not live long enough to join Lee in his march into Pennsyl-

vania or Jackson in his famous valley campaign. They are glorified with reservation, while the Civil War heroes are canonized.

In many of the grammar and high schools in the South compulsory reading of the Bible is ordered; but the same thing is true of several Northern States—Maryland and Delaware, for example. Probably one of the strangest things that has happened in the South in recent years, however, was the opposition of the Virginia Baptist Association to a bill proposed in the Virginia Legislature some years ago for compulsory reading of the Bible. The plan was supported by the Ku Klux Klan of Virginia and the Methodist groups; but the Baptists in the State led in the fight against it; and the Rev. R. H. Pitt, editor of the *Virginia Religious Herald*, a Baptist publication, drafted a resolution, which was adopted, declaring, "We want every one to read the Bible, but we want it done voluntarily. We stand for the right of every one to read and interpret the Bible according to the dictates of his heart. Enforced conformity is an unholy alliance of State and Church. We are guardians of Christianity and we must preserve the voluntary principle of Christianity or there will be chaos."

To the credit of the Virginia Baptists, it also must be stated that they vigorously opposed and helped to defeat legislation designed to prohibit the teaching of evolution in the public schools of the Old Dominion. Outside of Louisville, Kentucky, which is an important Baptist center, there probably is no more liberal group of that denomination in America than the Virginia Baptists.

It is unfortunate, however, that the Virginians are tied neck and leg to the prohibition law, and that their brethren in other parts of the South are so far behind them in their liberalism.

The centers of real intellectual liberalism are to be found in the colleges and universities of the South, and this is true in spite of the fact that a large majority of these institutions, which are not State supported, are supported and sponsored by the Protestants, chiefly by the Baptists and Methodists. North Carolina was one of the pioneers in university education. Her university at Chapel Hill is one of the oldest State universities in the South, or in the country for that matter; and to-day she stands out as one of the most liberal institutions in the South as well as one of the best from an educational standpoint. It was deeply disappointing to the admirers of this institution some years ago, however, when after making a systematic survey of the textile industry in North Carolina, with a view to recommending improvements in the conditions of the workers, the surveyors threw up the white flag in the face of a protest from the textile manufacturing interests. Save for this and other minor gestures of the kind, North Carolina is second to none in her jealous promotion of liberalism and modern education.

Other centers of liberalism are the University of Virginia; Vanderbilt University, at Nashville; Tulane, at New Orleans; and the University of Alabama, at Tuscaloosa. These institutions give the most modern training in the leading professions. I dare say there are no better law schools in the country than at the University

of Virginia, Washington and Lee University, at Lexington, Va., and at Vanderbilt and North Carolina. The University of Virginia also has a fine medical school. In the South the members of the faculty, as well as the school officials, from the President down, are closer to their students than in the Universities of the North.

Some of the country's finest preparatory schools are to be found in the South, and the same is true of her military schools. Notable among the latter is the Virginia Military Institute, at Lexington, Virginia, which has been called by Army officers, "the West Point of the South." Other fine military schools are the Virginia Polytechnic Institute at Blacksburg, the Georgia Tech at Atlanta, and the South Carolina Military Academy, better known as "Citadel." These four schools, during the World War, furnished some of the most efficient officers in the American army. An incongruous procedure, however, was the institution, at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute a few years ago, of coeducation. This, I believe, has placed that school at a disadvantage as compared with other schools of the kind in the South. Young women, of course, do not have to take part in the military discipline, but receive training in all other departments. The result is, unfortunately, that the morale at the school is not as high as it used to be. Coeducation in the universities, highly distasteful to students and alumni at first, has proved to be more or less a success.

The denominational colleges in the South have had much the same experience that William and Mary College had. When William and Mary was founded in

1693 it was designed primarily to train young men for the ministry in the Episcopal church, or Church of England, as it was then. William and Mary now, however, is not unlike other colleges, is supported by the State and offers all the branches of academic training. In the leading denominational colleges, for young men and women, alike, there is to-day little of the denominational influence. There is a tendency, of course, to place in charge of these schools a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian or Episcopal educator, as the case may be; but the students are in most cases as free in their conduct and their thinking as if they were in a non-sectarian school in the North. In some of them chapel attendance is compulsory; but in most of them it is not. Some of the graduates, of course, go into the Protestant ministry or into church work, and many of them maintain their denominational adherence after graduation; but on the whole their lives, after graduation, show no more denominational influence than do the graduates of non-sectarian schools.

Teachers in the graded and high schools are probably not as well equipped as those in the North, although this is changing for the better as the result of the work of normal schools and the raising of requirements in many of the States. Salaries are woefully inadequate. But in the higher institutions of learning, and particularly in the State universities, the instructors are on a par with any of those in the North, and the best of them are well paid. The universities of the South, too, are fortunate in their executives. The college presidents, as a rule, are liberal-minded, progressive and enterprising. Dr. Edwin H.

Alderman, of the University of Virginia; Dr. Harry W. Chase, of the University of North Carolina; and Dr. George H. Denny, of the University of Alabama, are representative of this class of educators.

Some of the finest schools for young women in America are to be found in the South. Among the leading ones might be named Hollins College at Hollins, Virginia; Peabody, at Nashville; Stuart Hall and Mary Baldwin, at Staunton, Virginia; Randolph-Macon College, at Lynchburg, Virginia; and Agnes Scott College at Atlanta, Georgia. The traditions and manners and customs which have made the women of the South famous for their charm and attractiveness are still maintained, in large measure, at these schools, but, of course, they have not permitted bygone ideas to prevent them from adopting many of the modern educational methods.

In most of the Southern States the social and religious status of the public school teachers is surrounded by but few restrictions; but it is noteworthy that in the State of North Carolina, some injustices have been practiced. Some years ago two or three teachers were dismissed when it was discovered that they were members of the Roman Catholic church. In a certain North Carolina village a young woman, upon becoming a teacher in the public schools, contracted to "take a vital interest in all phases of Sunday school work . . . to abstain from all dancing, immodest dressing, and any other conduct unbecoming a teacher and a lady . . . not to go out with any young men," unless it was in connection with Sunday-school work. She also promised not to fall in love, become

engaged or secretly to marry. And above all she was to donate all her "time, service and money without stint for the uplift and benefit of the community."

This is a strange contract in a State that boasts of having declared its independence from Great Britain in the famous Mecklenburg Declaration a year or more before Jefferson wrote his well-known document.

There was a time when the native college professors and public school teachers said, "He don't," but to-day they are more precise, although a superintendent of schools in Chicago in a public statement a few years ago announced that it would be perfectly proper for his teachers to teach their pupils to say, "It is me." And why should they be so precise when the radio announcers whose voices are heard in all parts of the South use the bastard word, "broadcasted"?

There is a tendency in the military schools and in some of the preparatory schools to do away with Greek letter fraternities; but in the majority of colleges and universities their poker homes and drinking palaces are still retained. It is safe to say that no more potent influence calculated to send the young students of the South along the road to hellfire,—provided the good brethren are correct in their geographical conclusions,—than the Greek letter fraternities in the Southern institutions of learning to-day. I understand that the height of heroism in some of these organizations is the ability to remain above the table longer than any other brother on the campus. And, I might add that the Greek letter fraternity usually embraces all the Southern college student learns about Greek.

The South, like many other parts of the country, suffers, in so far as its professions are concerned, from the too frequent tendency of young men who are better fitted for the plow or the grocery store to go into the law, of young men who are better fitted to be butchers' assistants to go into medicine and surgery, and of young men who are far better equipped for side-show whooping and auctioneering to go into the ministry. But, society, sooner or later, adjusts them to her needs, and after practicing their respective professions for a while, many of them turn to trades better suited to them. There is no town of 60,000 to 75,000 inhabitants that is not overrun with attorneys-at-law. Some of them hang up their shingles, join all the golf and drinking clubs, examine two or three property titles, pray for their first horse case, and then get a job as a clerk with a railroad company or go into the insurance business, because the outlook doesn't seem as good as it did in Daniel Webster's or John Marshall's day. In recent years, however, educators have complained that these tendencies are not confined to the South; and that even the molds at Harvard and Yale and Princeton turn out would-be lawyers, doctors and engineers who would have been better off if they had followed their fathers' footsteps into more lowly occupations.

Among the wealthier citizens of the South,—the number is increasing every year,—there has been a growing practice of sending young men and young women to Northern institutions of higher learning; but usually these students, after graduation, remain in the North. Those who return to the South to make their homes, some-

times exert a wholesome influence on their fellow citizens when they go into business or into professions by carrying to the South not only the latest ideas and methods, but a new spirit of tolerance concerning Northern ideas and methods.

Improved methods of education in the minor schools and colleges and universities unquestionably are having beneficial results. Each year brings a broader outlook. Each year lifts a larger number of children and youths to higher planes of usefulness. There is, of course, a prevailing practice to standardize, as most of the schools in the North are doing. But why not? The general run of folk are better off standardized; and those who possess genius, ability and enterprise above the average, always are able to lift themselves above standardization. It would be a sorry world, anyway, if all our young men and women were geniuses. Such a thing would make civilization rather dizzy. I confess that it very often is futile and unnecessary to undertake to educate certain types of young folk. But that is something for the learned educators to fight out. Suffice it to say that education in the South is in most of its phases on a par with the education in the North and East. Indeed, there is developing a kind of nationalism among the educators of the country, including the Southerners, which in time ought to erase, or partly erase, sectional lines in so far as methods are concerned. Local control of histories and biologies in the South probably will continue until Gabriel comes with his trumpet and commands the blue and the gray to follow him into the Sweet Ultimate; but one needs no

imagination to visualize a South of the not distant future, educating its young people in most of its institutions in a way that will more and more make the Southern States an integral part of America, and not a land marked by the metes and bounds of sectional prejudice.

CHAPTER XI

THE PRESS

One of the potent factors in the enlightenment and education of the Southern people in the South to-day is the daily press. Every important city has one or more daily newspapers, and practically every important town is the headquarters for a weekly. The weekly newspapers, of course, do not attempt to supply news of any value other than the personal items—weddings, births, deaths, property transfers and the latest crime.

The daily newspaper in the city, however, is exerting an influence on the people, that critics in the North seem not to have perceived, and I believe as time goes on the press will be one of the leading forces in destroying the lines of sectionalism and bringing the South out of its religious and political intolerances. Such an accomplishment is retarded at the outset by the fact that all the important dailies are Democratic in politics; but there has been a tendency in recent years on the part of some of them to become genuinely independent politically, and when they have learned that it not only is futile, but unprincipled to adhere to one political faith, whether or no, a new day will have dawned in the South.

The greatest news source for the Southern newspapers is the Associated Press, a reliable, non-partisan news gathering agency. The Associated Press supplies its members

with the current news from every corner of the globe; and in the South State-wide bureaus have been established which supply the dailies with the more important happenings in the States. The headquarters for these bureaus usually are at the State capitals. Inasmuch as the Associated Press is free of political bias and unprejudiced in its news selections, it provides Southern readers with a true history of the whole world as it is happening. And newspaper readers are to be found in the cities and their suburbs and on every rural route in the South. The result is that the Southern people, who in recent years have become avidious newspaper readers, are obtaining a broader outlook on local, State, National and international affairs. They probably are not conscious of this, but it is true.

In addition to the Associated Press, other news agencies, such as the United Press, for afternoon papers; the International News Service, and the Consolidated Press Association, supply news for the Southern dailies. Added to these are picture services, syndicated features of every description, and the comics and rotogravures. In the majority of the dailies the news is displayed and headed fearlessly. Twenty years ago, it would have been expected that a newspaper would keep from its news column news that might be considered injurious to its political causes, or policies; but that isn't done now. I am inclined to believe that the one-man ownership which usually is the case of the Southern newspaper, is largely responsible for this.

There is a notion in the North that Southern news-

papers are weak editorially. But this is a mistake. In no section of the country to-day is there a larger number of fearless editorial pages, directed by able and fearless writers. And I believe that it is the work of these men that will in time impress upon the people of the South the necessity of getting away from its political bondage, if it ever hopes to prosper politically. The same thing applies to religious intolerance. The editorial pages of the South are open to the free discussion of public matters. It is noteworthy that the wettest newspapers open their columns to dry critics and the driest dailies print the letters of their wettest readers. This same kind of liberalism applies to all the shades of opinion on public questions, and it is having a favorable effect.

I have stated in a previous chapter that the colleges and universities in the South are the centers of liberalism. I wish to amend this. There is no group of men living in the Southern States to-day that is more liberal-minded and forward-looking than the newspaper men, and particularly the editors. There are, of course, here and there editors whose opinions are narrow on the prohibition and religious issues. There also are editorial writers who conceive of the South as a place that must withstand Yankeeism and all that it implies. But there, fortunately, are not many such editors. Among the younger editorial writers in the South are to be found some of the staunchest champions of tolerance and liberalism.

A glowing example of forward-looking liberalism is the Columbus, Georgia, *Enquirer-Sun*, edited by Julian Harris, son of Joel Chandler Harris. In his newspaper he

has fought with the utmost vigor the Ku Klux Klan, the prohibition laws and religious intolerance; and to understand what this means, one must remember that Georgia is the Klan's spawning place; that it is the hotbed of Protestantism; and that it is one of the driest states in the South politically. But the Columbus paper has not been alone in its valiant service. Among its compatriots are to be named the Birmingham, Alabama, *News*, whose editorials are written by the able pen of Alfred Battle Bealle, and the Columbia, South Carolina, *Record*, edited by R. Charlton Wright, one of the South's most fearless editors. In a State where white men think no more of staging a lynching party than Sunday schools do of holding a picnic, Mr. Wright for years has been making war in his editorial columns on lynching, prohibition and religious intolerance. In Tennessee where a Governor and his Legislature forced through a ridiculous anti-evolution law, out of which the famous Scopes trial grew, the Nashville *Banner* unhesitatingly has attacked the Governor at every turn. And this is done in a territory that is thick with fundamentalists. In Memphis, the *Commercial-Appeal* has fought the Klan for years, and through a campaign of ridicule and exposure has well-nigh driven the order out of Western Tennessee.

The New Orleans *Item-Tribune* and *Times-Picayune* for many years have been waging a fight against religious intolerance. Their task, however, is not as difficult as that of other Southern dailies because they circulate in a large Roman Catholic territory. In North Carolina, the Greensboro *News*, the Raleigh *Times* and the Charlotte

Observer have fought and are still fighting for liberal issues. The Raleigh *News and Observer*, owned by Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy in Mr. Wilson's cabinet, suffers from the echo of Bryanism in so far as prohibition and Democracy are concerned; but to Mr. Daniels's credit, it must be said his columns are open to his opponents and he fights his battles fairly.

One of the strongest newspapers in the South is the Norfolk, Virginia, *Virginian-Pilot*, edited by Louis I. Jaffe. It possesses a balance and sanity, a vision and sound philosophy on most public questions that few newspapers in the North possess. It probably is the only newspaper in Virginia that is heeded by the politicians. Another ably edited daily is the Richmond, Virginia, *News-Leader*, owned by John Stewart Bryan and edited by Dr. Douglas Freeman. Dr. Freeman is a talented editorial writer, although he often lacks initiative and temerity. The Lynchburg *News* (morning) and the Lynchburg *Advance* (afternoon), owned by Senator Carter Glass, are handicapped because they merely reflect Mr. Glass's views on public questions. The readers recognize this, and unless they happen to agree with the Senator's politics they are not a great deal impressed by the editorial utterances in the two newspapers. It must be said, however, that Robert Glass, the Senator's nephew, editor of the *News*, is one of the State's most talented writers. He possesses vigor and wit and a keen perception of the political truths of the day. It is a great pity that he hasn't an absolutely free hand in his work.

The Little Rock, Arkansas, *Arkansas Gazette*, is the

oldest daily newspaper west of the Mississippi River. Its editorials on the whole are liberal. In the latter part of May, 1927, it commended President Coolidge's work in connection with the Mississippi flood, at a time when other Southern newspapers were condemning the Executive. It is fearless and presents its news impartially, and I believe exerts a good influence through Arkansas, a State which next to Mississippi probably is one of the most backward commonwealths in the South.

The Jackson, Mississippi, *Clarion-Ledger*, was established in 1837, and is widely read in the State, although the Memphis newspapers have a large circulation in Northern Mississippi. Probably the strongest daily in Mississippi is the *Meridian Star*. This paper has the largest circulation in the State, and the Jackson *News* runs it a close second. These three papers, generally speaking, are liberal, although they show a slight tinge of religious bias on the side of Protestantism.

The Florida newspapers, notably those in Jacksonville, Miami and Tampa are feeling the effects of Northern influence, although they remain Democratic politically. Their Northern outlook is, of course, prompted by the invasion of thousands of Northerners into Florida. One of the strongest sheets in the State is the *Miami News*, owned by James M. Cox, one-time Democratic candidate for the Presidency and a resident of Ohio. While the *News* reflects Mr. Cox's political views too sharply, it is nevertheless a vigorous champion of progress and right-living in local affairs.

A noticeable thing about the Southern newspapers is the

large amount of space the majority of them give to so-called society news. In a ten-page week-day edition of the *Raleigh News and Observer*, for example, three-quarters of a page is devoted to society events. Some of the items, it is true, concern social activities in other North Carolina communities. The society columns probably are more democratic in their treatment of local residents than the Northern papers, particularly the metropolitan dailies. There probably is no more vigorous mingling of the Judy O'Gradys with the Colonels' ladies in the country than in the society columns in the South to-day. This is due in large measure to the fact that the newspaper publishers ten or twenty years ago adopted the policy of never offending the advertisers. If the wives of some of the advertisers happened to be Mrs. O'Gradys, they appeared in the society columns!

Advertisers in the South, however, no longer rule the policies of the dailies. I dare say that within the past fifteen or twenty years there has not been a city in the South whose newspaper has not at one time or another met the challenge of a protesting advertiser by telling him in effect that he would prefer to see him in hell rather than run his advertisement, if—

Considerable space is given by the dailies to sports; and the Saturday editions of all the progressive Southern newspapers give from one to two pages of so-called church news. This news, concerning the pulpit texts and musical programs of the churches of all denominations, save the Catholics, is published gratis. There has been a movement, initiated by Northern publishers, to make

the churches pay for the space as advertising, but nothing has come of the idea.

None of the important daily newspapers in the South is an advocate of the prohibition laws, and those that are dry are lukewarm. A notable exponent of this is the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, and its afternoon running mate, the *Louisville Times*. The latter paper, edited by Tom Wallace, scion of an old Kentucky family, is one of the strongest dailies in the South to-day; and I have a secret notion that when its columns contain references, more or less in favor of the dry law, they are half-hearted gestures of a man who really is not a strong believer in the prohibition laws. Mr. Wallace also is one of the wittiest paragraphers in the country; and a close second to him was the late Col. George M. Bailey, paragrapher for the Houston, Texas, *Post-Dispatch*, whose observations on prohibition and Democracy were among the leading truthful and adroit sayings in Southern newspaperdom. The *Birmingham Age-Herald*, before it was merged with the *Birmingham News*, was an ardent dry advocate; and from a standpoint of rivalry and competition it is a pity that the *News* absorbed it. I dare say there were many wet tears when this dry sheet was taken into the moist atmosphere of the *News* in the Spring of 1927.

All the Southern newspapers, without any exception, that have come to my notice, are strongly Wilsonian in their Democracy, and for that reason are in turn strong advocates of America's entry into the League of Nations. But there is a division among them on such matters as Bryanism. The influence of Mr. Bryan's political

philosophy is still seen guiding the editorial pens of such important newspapers as the *Raleigh News and Observer* and the *Atlanta Journal* and of many of the weeklies. Against the *Journal* in Atlanta is the *Constitution*, much weaker than in the days of Henry Grady, but fighting as best it can, the prohibition farce, the Ku Klux Klan and religious intolerance. To its credit, it also must be said that the *Constitution* in 1926 vigorously condemned a plan proposed by a group of Atlantans to bar Negroes from the barber trade. Such a course would have thrown out of business a firm of barbers headed by one of the most respectable Negroes in the South. The *Constitution* traditionally has sponsored the issues of the right wing of the Democratic party, and were it in more talented hands editorially, it would be one of the foremost newspapers in the South.

Among the cleverest newspapers in the South, from a paragraphic standpoint, I believe, are the *Virginian-Pilot* of Norfolk, the *Louisville Times*, the *Birmingham News*, the *Arkansas Gazette*, the *Columbia State*, the *Houston Post-Dispatch*, the *Dallas News*, the *Nashville Banner*, the *El Paso Times*, the *Florence, Alabama, Herald*, and the *Lynchburg, Virginia, News*. The *Norfolk* daily early in 1927 voiced succinctly the general attitude of these sheets toward the prohibition law when it observed, that "About the only hard thing to secure under the prohibition law is a conviction." It is noteworthy that often in the little quips that these paragraphers create are to be found the sincere and intimate views of the newspapers on public questions. A poetic license is exercised in the

writing of paragraphs; and if one desires to "feel the pulse" of Southern newspaperdom, the best way to do it is to consult the paragraphs of the Southern dailies. They contain truthful observations that the responsible editor would not dare voice in the serious portions of his editorial columns.

In addition to the space given to society news, some of the papers allot considerable space to items concerning the activities of clubs and fraternal orders. These are in addition to the weekly reviews of service club luncheons. And a few of the papers set aside special portions of their columns to news concerning the Negroes. These articles are, of course, designed to promote circulation. But they do more than that. They stimulate interest among a class of people who are ordinarily not newspaper readers, or readers of any kind for that matter. The result is that in a given radius of circulation, the circulation of the average newspaper may easily be multiplied by five for the number of people actually reached. And it is noteworthy that the more important city papers have subscribers who live on rural routes fifty and sometimes one hundred miles distant.

With the newspapers reaching most of their subscribers on the day they are published, and bringing to them the local, state, national and international events of the twelve hours previous, an education on current events is provided for the people that cannot be matched by colleges and universities. Interest in newspapers in the South was tremendously stimulated during the World War, before and after America joined the conflict. Dailies

which before that time were conservative in their display of news blazoned forth with headlines that would have been the envy of the most progressive metropolitan sheets. And they were devoured by the Southerners who, like people throughout the country, had relatives and friends in every branch of service in the conflict. This was true of the blacks as well as the whites.

Since the war, while the dailies have been more conservative in their treatment of news, they have resorted to the old-time methods of heading unusual events, so the interest stimulated during the war has not only been maintained, but has in the very nature of things brought about a gradual increase in circulation among Southern newspapers. And when the quality of news is considered,—such as the world-wide service of the Associated Press, and such foreign services as the *New York World* and *New York Times* syndicates,—together with well-balanced interpretations of the events in the editorial columns, one is justified in believing that the newspaper of the South is one of the chief factors in teaching that section of the country that many of its political, social and religious notions, which it has held for so many years, do not belong in an up-to-date civilization.

Other factors that enter into the molding of Southern opinion on current events are such Northern dailies as the *New York Times* and *New York World* and the better class of weekly and monthly magazines. The *Saturday Evening Post* and *Ladies' Home Journal* probably have the largest circulations in their class; but the number of readers of the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's*, *Scribner's* and

Century are increasing,—not to mention the much-hated *American Mercury*, edited by Henry L. Mencken. It should be remembered that the standard magazines are not what they were twenty years ago. Their development has been just as rapid and remarkable during the past two decades as the evolution of the skirts worn by the young women of the South. Intellectually such magazines as the *Atlantic* and *Harper's*, at one time dragged the floor. Now they indulge in short-skirted philosophies and jazz-like attitudes. All this, of course, is having its influence on the minds of Southerners and particularly on the younger generations. I dare say the *American Mercury* is more widely read in the colleges and universities and among the newspaper men than elsewhere, although I have a sneaking notion that it is devoured by some of the pastors who are as curious as other mortals to know what the intellectual acrobat of Baltimore is going to say next. It is noteworthy, too, that half a dozen or more Southern newspapers print weekly articles syndicated by Mr. Mencken. To understand what this means one must remember that Mr. Mencken's geographical notion of the South is that it is an island full of "yokels" surrounded by a waste of "bilge."

An interesting practice which many of the Southern newspapers have is the printing of a daily digest of editorial views from newspapers throughout the country. All shades and colors of opinions concerning controversial topics are given, something that was not done twenty years ago. And when such a practice is reënforced by the appearance of the *Literary Digest* in the homes of thou-

sands of Southerners, one is reminded again that the Southern people are not the isolated morons that Northern critics picture them as being. Reviews and criticisms of the latest books of fiction and non-fiction, written by local talent, appear in many of the Southern sheets. Among the leading reviewers, in my opinion, are Hunter Stagg of the Richmond, Virginia, *Times-Dispatch*, and Henry Bellamann of the Columbia, South Carolina, *Record*. Both of these men are as able as any of the better-known reviewers on metropolitan dailies and literary weeklies. Mr. Bellamann is a poet of no mean talent. At this point I cannot refrain from expressing the belief that in the cities of the South and in the smaller communities there is more culture per thousand inhabitants than in the metropolitan centers. The educated folk keep up with the latest books and plays; they form various kinds of literary clubs; holding readings and lectures, and in a general way are better informed about the arts and sciences than the same kind of people in the big cities. In a town of 65,000 persons in Virginia, a Shakespeare club organized more than thirty years ago is still in existence, although I have been told that its members have not read one of Shakespeare's plays for more than ten years. Ibsen, and probably Eugene O'Neill, are on their programs. These cultural undertakings, as I have suggested, are stimulated and often promoted by the newspapers, although one of the rules of the Virginia Shakespeare Club is that it is never to have any publicity about its programs or membership; and it is to-day considered one of the exclusive organizations in the community.

One of the most interesting changes in newspaperdom in the South since the Civil War has been in the type of editorial writers. The editor of the old school, who wrote his copy with a pencil and whose mind would not flower properly unless he was filled with liquor, has passed from the scene. An outstanding figure of this kind whom I have in mind was still alive early in 1927, although not working at an editorial desk. He was of the Watterson and Grady school, a fearless writer, a ready fighter and an all-nighter in the matter of drinking. He was as independent as Mussolini and as pugnacious as an Irish patriot, and he loved nothing better than to engage in an editorial duel with a fellow editor. He was a staunch Democrat, but a bitter foe of Bryan and all his followers. He was a religionist, but a strong foe of prohibition and anti-evolution idiocies. And I might as well say it: he was a Virginian who used the broad "a" and resorted to "cyar" and "cyarpet," but was willing to drink with the lowliest fellow citizen. He was a man whose heart was as big as his brain, and whose feet were as big as both. He was rawboned, rough, sentimental, ugly, cruel and tender all in one. When he was editor, he also was king; and when the king spoke through the columns of his paper he infuriated the Puritans, provoked a chuckle among the heathens; and all confessed that he was a "great writer."

Such a man, unfortunately, was the last of the Mohicans. In the very nature of things, he could not remain in power. Economic as well as social conditions forced him out of his editorial chair more than a decade ago, and when last heard from he was writing political

essays for the letter column of a Richmond newspaper, revealing that the old fire still burned within him. When he receives the summons I imagine the shades of Greeley, Dana, Bowles, Watterson and Grady will greet him in Hades and give him three rousing cheers, for he was one of 'em.

In one editorial chair in the South a new type of editor is to be found to-day. I have in mind the editor of one of the largest afternoon newspapers in point of circulation. He is a university graduate, a possessor of the Ph.D. degree, a thorough Greek scholar, a fine orator and a man of wide reading. He is a talented writer and a man who probably entertains clear-cut opinions. But he has an eye for business even more than he has for the well-turned phrase. The result is that his caution vitiates his power as an editor. I do not mean by this that he is beholden altogether to his large advertisers, although he gives them generous consideration, which is natural. But he does something that the old editor never dreamed of doing. He weighs every word he writes in terms of what it will mean to his future and to his paper's future, rather than in terms of what is right or for the public good. He probably argues that business is business, and that those fellows who want to fight battles can do so, but he knows which side of his bread the butter is on. I fear that in his approach to public questions he leans a bit on the side of expediency rather than principle; but, of course, he is never happier than when principle happens to fit in with his plans.

Such an editor, it might be remembered, is not a new

figure to those persons who have had anything to do with business and professional men generally. And it will be argued that inasmuch as even an editor must have his bacon, just like the banker, the merchant or the lawyer, he must mix his courage with wisdom. However that may be, I believe I have described this editor accurately. It must be admitted that he is an extreme type. He represents the writer who has a financial interest in the paper which he edits. Fortunately, he is not a prevailing type; but he is representative of a growing tendency in modern journalism in the South. Most of the editors in the South,—the majority of them are not owners or part owners,—are given a wide latitude in their work, and this is particularly true of those whose publishers are financially independent.

In the measure that the Southern newspapers are receiving news from all parts of the world, they are, through their Associated Press bureaus and correspondents in the South, broadcasting throughout the United States the more important events that are shaping in the South. The dispatches concerning these events are supplemented with pictures and feature articles, Southern newspaper men are furnishing material to the magazines about the South, and many of the dailies exchange with the sheets in other sections of the country. The result is that as the South grows and prospers her resources and her changing manners and customs are coming sharply to the attention of the rest of the country. Her dailies, for many years to come, will fight the battles of Democracy, as long as any white man carries the party banner. For a long time

they will keep alive the traditions of the Lost Cause. And no man can say how long they will continue to maintain what they conceive to be "white supremacy." But in all other things the South is learning from her newspapers that the world is a large affair after all, and that the States which make up the Solid South are but a very small part of it, although an important part of it, to be sure.

CHAPTER XII

GREAT AND NEAR-GREAT

There is a persistent myth in the South that the section is the home of the nation's greatest men, and Southerners, particularly Virginians, point with pride to the fact that twelve of the thirty Presidents of the United States have been natives. The Old Dominion lays claim to eight sons who reached the White House, but three of them,—William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor and Woodrow Wilson,—were not residents when they were elected. In addition to the Virginians were Andrew Jackson, born in North Carolina; James K. Polk, born in North Carolina; Andrew Johnson, another native of that State, and Abraham Lincoln, who saw the light of day for the first time in Kentucky.

Of this imposing galaxy of illustrious sons there were but three who may be rated as really great men, namely, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson. Washington lived in a day when his narrow Federalism was permissible, although it was ridiculed even then by a small minority. A man who opposed the separation of Church and State, a man who in his political thinking leaned more toward a monarchy than a democracy, Washington was little more than a heavy-bodied, big-fisted person whose real place belonged in the army and not in the Presidential chair. If he were living to-day

and attempted to conduct himself as he did when he was President, all the newspapers in the South, followed by a train of howling Democrats, would cry him down. But when I say this I do not mean that Washington's work during the American Revolution was not valuable. His conduct in the war entitles him to rank as a great soldier; but I wonder what the Wilsonian Democrats in the South would do if Washington were running for office on his famous platform of "no entangling alliances"?

James Madison was a fine scholar, and that statement tells his whole story. As a President he was a miserable failure. The diplomats of Europe tricked and befuzzled him time and again; the American Senate ruled him; and he was as unable to direct Congress as Calvin Coolidge has been. Stripped of his scholarly attainments and his unquestionable knowledge of constitutional law, Madison was as colorless a man as ever sat in the President's chair. He was far from being a great man.

James Monroe was merely an average Virginia gentleman of little imagination and no brilliance. Wilsonian Democrats in the South probably will rate him as a great man because of the famous document he promulgated in 1823. But what would they think of Mr. Monroe if they were told that his Doctrine not only laid down the principle that every portion of the American continent must be free of European control, but implied as well that America should take no part in European politics, a philosophy that would not fit in well with the League of Nation's idea? Monroe, fortunately, served in what historians have termed the "era of good feeling"; but the

real test of his statesmanship came in 1806 when Mr. Jefferson was President. The latter had ordered Monroe and William Pinkney of Maryland, to London to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain, and specifically instructed them to incorporate in the treaty clauses providing against the impressment of American sailors by the English and for an indemnity for the seizure by the English of American goods and vessels. Monroe ignored the instructions and the Anglo-American treaty of 1806 amounted to practically nothing. His failure to obey Jefferson had a great deal to do with the development of events which led to the War of 1812.

William Henry Harrison left his native Virginia to enter the army at the age of eighteen, and the climax to his successful military career was his victory over the Indians near Lafayette, Indiana, in 1811. On the crest of hero-worship he was shunted into the White House; and it is probably fortunate that death called him within a month following his inauguration, because he possessed none of the talents that a man should have to be a competent and successful President. His forte was fighting Indians, and not hard-headed Congressmen.

John Tyler in many respects was the William E. Borah of his day, although his ascendancy to the White House was as accidental as Calvin Coolidge's. He was like Borah because the politicians couldn't put their fingers on him politically. The Democrats declared he was not a Democrat and the Whigs held that he was not a Whig. The result was that he exerted no leadership over Congress; and about the only thing that happened during his admin-

istration was the annexation of Texas. He was a fine orator and something of a scholar, and that was about all. He was not a great man, and certainly not a great man in the eyes of the red-hot Confederates in the South because in 1860 he had sense enough and courage enough to oppose secession.

Zachary Taylor left his native Virginia when he was a boy and migrated to Kentucky, where he grew up. In young manhood the Indians were still prowling around in the land of Bourbon, and, like William Henry Harrison, he learned statecraft from the redskins. His brilliant victory over Santa Anna at Buena Vista in 1847 won for him the sobriquet, "Old Rough and Ready," which, like the homely sap-bucket in Vermont, was the thing the people at the time believed would be suitable for the White House. He was elected in 1848 and died in the summer of 1850. He probably was lucky, because had he lived his indecision on the slavery question, which was growing larger and larger at this time, might have engulfed him, and the country as well, in disaster. An amiable, big-framed man; but not a great one.

Andrew Johnson, in many respects, was like Abraham Lincoln. He struggled through the same kind of hardships in his boyhood and young manhood. He did not learn to read and write until he was a grown man. For his rise to eminence he probably deserves more credit than any man whose presence has adorned the White House; but his struggles, and his rise, did not, as they did in Lincoln's case, make him a great man. His political patron saint was Andrew Jackson, probably because Jackson also was

a native of North Carolina; but he was never able to get over his lumber-camp accent and a lack of poise which stood in his way all his life. I must confess that a different story might have been told if he had had a Congress composed of Southern Democrats instead of the hostile Northern Republicans with whom he had to contend. His career was more pathetic than anything else; and his awkward figure never approached within walking distance of the pinnacle of greatness.

Andrew Jackson was a quarrelsome gentleman who did more to bring confusion into the Democratic party than any other man whose name is associated with that great organization. He was bull-headed and belligerent; had not even the poise of a slaughterhouse keeper; and probably his greatest achievement was his famous attack on the doctrine of States' rights when he threatened to subdue South Carolina by force if she didn't behave herself in 1832. It is safe to say that the States' Rights Democrats in the South, and particularly the South Carolinians, admire Jackson about as much as Senator Jim Reed admired the late Wayne B. Wheeler.

The most that can be said for James K. Polk, another native of North Carolina, is that he appointed a cabinet a little above the average. One of its luminaries was Robert J. Walker, who as Secretary of the Treasury drafted the only real Democratic tariff measure the South ever produced. Practically all Polk's policies were shaped by his cabinet advisers. An insight into how his mind worked was the way in which he dealt with Nicholas Trist, the man who negotiated the American-Mexican

treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. He sent Trist to negotiate the treaty; Trist drafted it, had it signed and returned to Polk. The latter didn't like the document, rebuked Trist and threatened to dismiss him, and then suddenly accepted the treaty. If Polk had listened to Walker and Buchanan of his cabinet and to Daniel S. Dickinson, of New York, and Edward A. Hannegan, of Indiana, leaders in the Senate, the United States would have annexed the whole of Mexico; and Sancho Villa, of recent outlaw fame, probably would have been a railroad construction laborer instead of a revolutionary chief. But that was one time when he didn't listen. He tricked his Democratic friends in Pennsylvania into believing he was a protectionist, and then turned around and permitted Walker to draft a free trade bill that continued in existence for fifteen years!

I have sketched briefly, as possible, the Southern Presidents, most of whom hailed from Virginia, and, as I have said, but three of them, in my opinion, were great,—Jefferson, Lincoln and Wilson. And Lincoln, it should be remembered, was not a native of the Solid South, although his grandparents were Virginians. I shall not go into the characteristics and achievements that made these men great; but in speaking of the great men of the South one cannot remain confined to the Presidents. The greatest Southerner, I believe, was Robert E. Lee. And "Stonewall" Jackson, a native of West Virginia, also was a great man. Thus we have five men out of the South who may be rated great. Jackson, however, was a religious fanatic and a hard disciplinarian; but, like Lee, his

ambitions prompted him to travel the high paths that lead above the petty dust of the world. So many so-called great men are opportunists whose endeavors are featured by selfish desires and aims; but the world cannot point to a quintet of men whose hearts were more altruistic and whose minds were given to nobler inventions than Jefferson, Lincoln, Lee, Jackson and Wilson.

In discussing the Presidents who have been born in the South, I have, of course, discussed that section's leading noted men. This does not mean, however, that the South has not produced more than her share of noted men. But there is a distinction between being noted and being great. The words of Carlyle come to me. In his essay on Walter Scott, he declared, "Whether Sir Walter Scott was a great man, is still a question with some; but there can be no question with any one that he was a most noted and even notable man." One can say the same thing of a large number of native Southerners. There is John Marshall, for example, who in all our annals probably stands out as our greatest constitutional lawyer, and one who, more than any other one man, gave strength to the Federal Constitution's protective force over the Union. But critics of his day held that he was but an average common law or equity lawyer. In some respects he undoubtedly was a great man; but did not possess the essential greatness which in my opinion marked the men I have enumerated.

Man's place of birth, of course, is an accident. Some wise fellow once said that he could have been born in any land if his mother had just thought of going there. The

South has produced noted men in the same accidental way; and some of them have gone to other climes to win fame. From North Carolina, for example, Thomas H. Benton went to Missouri, where he became a distinguished member of the United States Senate; and Joseph G. Cannon, of stogie fame, was born in North Carolina, but made his mark in Illinois. Virginia produced Woodrow Wilson. On the other hand, not a few men have migrated to the South from foreign lands and made their mark. There was Judah Benjamin, a Jew, and C. G. Memminger, who came from the West Indies and Germany respectively, and sat in the Confederate cabinet. There was James Iredell of the United States Supreme Court, who went to North Carolina from England. Pierre Soule, a distinguished member of the United States Senate from Louisiana, was born in France; and Alexander Smyth, distinguished representative of a Virginia district in Congress, of all places, was born in Ireland.

These things mean little or nothing in so far as sectional lines are concerned. The truth is that circumstances, fortune and individuality, whether in the South, North, West or East, in this country have had a part in the making of our notable men. Indeed, these things have had a part in the making of notable men in all lands and in all ages. Men have their different ideas of what constitutes greatness. In my opinion Emerson hit the nail on the head when he said, "The great man makes the great thing." Therefore, I consider Thomas A. Edison a great man, but cannot consider Mr. Coolidge a great man. Pasteur was a great man; Pat Harrison of Mississippi is not.

And so on. It would be needless to enumerate such invidious comparisons, but history is full of them. And what I am driving at is that because a man reaches the Presidency, or even the Supreme Court, it does not always make him great. In the nature of things, it may make him noted, but not great.

The South unquestionably has produced some heroic characters,—and so has the North. The annals of the Civil War are filled with accounts of brave exploits on both sides. Thomas J. Jackson stood like a stone wall in battle while shots and shell were falling about him. On the other side, at a later date, Sheridan made his famous ride out of Winchester, and by his bravery turned the tide of battle. The Civil War, like all wars, brought out the courage and nobility of men on both sides.

It is an interesting fact that Southerners have contributed in many ways to the nation's advancement. From the days of George Sandys down to the present day of Commander Richard Evelyn Byrd, some of the notable acts that went into making the Republic itself and the Republic's fame, have been performed by Southerners. Sandys was born in England, but removed to Virginia, where he served as treasurer of the colony for three years. He built the first water-mill, the first ironworks and the first ship in the Old Dominion, and his translation of Ovid was English America's first literary production.

George Mason of Virginia drafted the first Bill of Rights in this country; Washington was our first President; Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence;

Madison had a leading hand in the writing of the Constitution and its first ten amendments; Patrick Henry, by his oratory, did more than any other one man to spur the Southerners into action at a time when the South was reluctant to war against the Crown. John Marshall made the Federal Constitution a working instrument. Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Virginia, the noted naval hydrographer, revolutionized ocean navigation. It was upon the report of John Randolph of Roanoke that the Library of Congress was based. And Robert Mills of South Carolina designed the Washington monument in Washington city. It was Commander Byrd who flew over the North Pole for the first time in an airplane. It was—

But why go on? The South has plenty of noted men and heroes. She also, as a matter of interest, has the distinction of having sent the first Negroes to the United States Senate. Hiram R. Revels, of Mississippi, was the first. He remained in the Upper House a year. And P. B. S. Pinchback, of Louisiana, was the second. The South also produced Ty Cobb; and if another gentleman by that name had been born two hundred miles further down the river, the South would have produced Mr. Irvin Cobb. Irvin, apparently to spite the South, was born in Paducah, Kentucky. In Civil War days Howell Cobb of Georgia was a nationally known statesman, an orator of note, and a courageous soldier. But when you speak of Cobb of Georgia nowadays, it is in terms of stealing bases.

The fact that when you speak of Cobb of Georgia in terms of stealing bases and weigh his greatness by batting

averages brings sharply to the front the fact that since the Civil War the South, in so far as its native sons who have remained on its soil are concerned, has not produced in quality and volume as it did before the Civil War. It is a long cry, for example, from Howell Cobb to William David Upshaw, the erstwhile famous Congressional evangelist of the Cracker State. But it is not difficult to understand why there has been a dearth of great men since the Civil War. It is the old story: the Solid South and its abiding adherence to one political faith. The very fact that party leaders in their national councils nowadays no more think of running a citizen of the Solid South for the Presidency than they would think of running an Eskimo, whether the man is fitted for the job or not, is the reason why the South produces no so-called great men. This political isolation, however, has not prevented the South from producing men of prominence, some of whom have exerted a wide influence in party affairs, in Congress and in administrative councils when the Democrats have been in power. It is noteworthy, too, that in Democratic party conventions, the Southern delegates, while they have never been able to name a standard-bearer from their own neck of woods, have, through the two-thirds rule, been able to prevent the nomination of men they didn't want. And they will continue to do this so long as the two-thirds rule and the unit rule are retained by the national party organization.

It was but natural for Southerners, during colonial, Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary days, to take the

leading part in shaping the Republic's destiny. But, even at that, New England was not far behind them, and it was the genius of New England that finally succeeded in breaking up what they called the "Virginia dynasty,"—the leadership of Virginians in national affairs from the days of John Smith to the outbreak of the Civil War. The war, however, closed the gates of national leadership against the Southerners; and since that conflict those Southerners who have achieved fame outside the halls of Congress and cabinet chambers usually have been those who left the South for other climes. Woodrow Wilson is the outstanding example. To-day Southerners take it as a matter of fact that so long as they remain solid politically such a condition will never change. And as things look at this writing, the South is destined to remain solid for many election years to come.

During colonial, Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary times, the South, particularly Virginia and the Carolinas, formed practically the heart of the nation as constituted in those periods. It is interesting to review how the country's population center has shifted since 1790. In that year it was twenty-three miles east of Baltimore. Ten years later it was eighteen miles west of Baltimore. In 1810 it was forty miles northwest by west of Washington, somewhere in Virginia. Then it shifted to within sixteen miles east of Moorefield, West Virginia, in 1820, which in that year was in Virginia. By 1850 it had moved to a point twenty-three miles southeast of Parkersburg, West Virginia. In 1880 it was eight miles west by south of Cincinnati, somewhere in Kentucky. Then it gradually

moved into Indiana; and to-day the center of population is at a point in Owen county, Indiana.

Inasmuch as in 1790 the center of population was at a point almost midway in a narrow strip running from the northern Florida border to the uppermost tip of New England, and inasmuch as Virginia and Massachusetts were the first colonies in this area settled by the English whose influence was to have more bearing on the new nation's destiny than any other, it was as natural for the leaders of the time to come from Virginia and adjacent States and from New England as it is for polar bears to come from the northern ice fields. From where else in America could the great and near-great men of our early period have come?

When and if the South breaks away from its political solidarity, it should, without doubt, regain its place in the political sun which the Civil War deprived it of. As I have said in a previous chapter, the South, in most respects, is not unlike other sections of the country. But in one thing it has an advantage. Its people,—that is, its white people,—are for the most part of pure strains or mixtures, chiefly the Scotch-Irish mixture. And this cannot be said for other sections. In the populous centers of the North, East, Middle West and West every race in the world is to be found, and while I do not wish to offend by naming some of the races, it is noticeable that certain of them do not produce the best of citizens. Police records show that certain Latin races in the big cities produce the largest number of criminals. The South is almost entirely free of this, save possibly in Florida and Lou-

isiana. Florida, within the past decade, has taken on a Northern flavor, and has become the gathering place of peoples of every nationality.

My personal opinion is that the Scotch-Irish mixture, from which such men as Jefferson, Calhoun, Clay and nearly all the other prominent leaders sprang, is the best in the land, in the South or elsewhere. After Governor Spotswood and his knights in 1716 discovered the beautiful valley of Virginia and the magnificent country which lay to the west, it was the signal for a rush of Scotch-Irish emigrants to America. Most of them went to Pennsylvania and then moved South into the Valley of Virginia and on into the mountains and hills of the Carolinas. It is from these people that many of the best folk in the South are descended. In Eastern Virginia the pure English blood predominated until about the time of the Revolution, when there were many intermarriages with the Scotch-Irish. Moreover, in South Carolina the Scotch-Irish and the French were mixed. The latter were the Huguenots who came over to escape persecution in France.

It is not generally known nowadays, particularly in view of the fact that Dean Inge of St. Paul's, London, on a recent visit to America suggested that the city of New York should be termed the "American Jerusalem," that the first Jewish emigrants to this country settled in Georgia and South Carolina as early as 1734. The Georgians opposed them on religious grounds and checked their immigration; but in Charleston, South Carolina, they built their first meeting house, and flourished. It was not

until 1765 that small groups of them emigrated to New York and to Newport. Up until the time of the Civil War, however, Jews were scarce in most of the Southern States; and they do not live there in large numbers now, excepting probably in Florida and Louisiana. In recent times there have been intermarriages between Jews and members of some of the best Southern families; but this was not countenanced by the social circles of fifty years ago.

It might be said that before the Civil War greatness, so-called, was, after the Shakespearean manner, forced on the South, in the very nature of things; and that nowadays the South has to do its utmost to force its greatness, so-called, on the nation, whenever such greatness appears. One of the most pathetic spectacles in recent years was the persistency with which the leader of the Alabama delegation in the Democratic National Convention in 1924, for more than one hundred ballots, shouted, "Alabama casts her twenty-four votes for Oscar Underwood!" Mr. Underwood was as fitted for the honor as any other man before the convention, and more fitted than most of them, but he had as much chance of being nominated as Dr. John Roach Straton has of becoming a member of the College of Cardinals.

While it is but natural, in all the circumstances, that the myth of greatness should have grown out of the deeds of the early Southerners, I must repeat that out of the army of noted men there was but a handful of really great men. The South has a right to be proud of her illustrious sons. They have wrought well, and have left

their influence on posterity; and if all of them were not great it was not because some of them did not try hard enough to be so. And besides, when one reviews the world's events since the memorable night the shepherds watched their flocks in the hills near Bethlehem, the South did pretty well for herself when she produced one great man,—Robert E. Lee.

CHAPTER XIII

IN CONGRESS

Before and during the Civil War the South, to use an expression current in many of the Southern States, "killed the job" in the matter of producing great and near-great men, so that the men within her borders who have reached prominence since the war,—that is, those men who have remained on their native soil,—suffer by comparison with their predecessors. I am speaking now chiefly of statesmen, so-called. It is true that many natives of the South, since the Civil War, have gone from their homeland and reached fame in various fields of endeavor. Woodrow Wilson is an example. Sergeant York of World War fame is another. Richard E. Byrd, the first man to fly over the North Pole, is still another. The list could be continued *ad infinitum*, including many notable names in the field of literature. But among the statesmen, so-called, who have remained in their native borders, there has been almost no greatness, and very little real achievement, compared with the character and works of the men who aided in the building of the Republic before the Civil War, and those who made their names immortal during that conflict.

There are many reasons for this, but two of them may be named as the chief ones: the South's solidarity in politics and her solidarity in Protestantism. As long as these

two things encircle her, it will be difficult for her native sons to remain in her borders and have full and successful play in liberal and progressive politics,—which, after all, is the kind of politics that has made Southerners great in the past.

In addition to the handicaps created by political and religious solidarity, is the tendency in the South, as elsewhere in America nowadays, to predicate statesmanship on a man's stand on the prohibition issue. The result is that men of high character in both camps suffer. A man might be of excellent character and of unquestioned ability as a statesman, but he will be vigorously opposed by the wets or drys, in accordance with whether he is a prohibitionist or not. Politics throughout America has descended to this level; but the South probably is worse than any other section in this respect. Southern representation in Congress as now constituted is largely dry; and anti-prohibitionists in the North, particularly men like Henry L. Mencken, have taken this to mean that these dry statesmen possess no good whatsoever. Such a view is puerile. Carter Glass, for example, is probably as dry as King Tut's bones, but his work in connection with the Federal Reserve System is one of the finest pieces of financial legislation that the parliament of any land in the world's history has had before it. On the other hand, the drys are just as intolerant. For example, there is the case of Oscar Underwood, probably one of the ablest men in the South, whose tariff law and whose wise assistance in shaping many of the most progressive measures passed by Congress made him notable throughout America. He is con-

sidered one of the Devil's own henchmen by many brethren in the South because he opposes the Ku Klux Klan and is not fond of the Prohibition law. The best he has been able to do in his Presidential aspirations in the national conventions was to obtain the votes of his own delegation. And Glass has had the same experience.

Because of the Protestant solidarity in the South, it is quite true that politicians, in many ways, have not been as sincere as they would have been otherwise in the matter of the Prohibition law. But the strange thing about the Protestant solidarity on the Prohibition law is the fact that individually a large portion of the population in the South is wet at heart,—that is to say, men and women drink as much liquor as they do in the North,—and as many of them, secretly, perhaps, disapprove of the liquor law as in the North.

It is not difficult to see, in the circumstances, that statesmen, or would-be statesmen, in the South are handicapped as soon as they enter public life; for they either must follow the edicts of the brethren or return to private life. The result is that the men of real brains and character in the South rarely ever enter public life,—unless they are appointed to posts of responsibility in the manner that Chief Justice Edward S. White was appointed to the Supreme Court. Underwood and Glass, as I have suggested, are sincere in their views on public questions. I believe that if Glass sincerely opposed the Prohibition law, he would say so and quit public life before the people forced him to quit it. But all politicians in the South are not of Glass's sincerity and integrity.

It has become a fashion among certain of the so-called intelligentsia in the North to rate as "morons," "yokels," "saps" and "babbitts" all public men and women in the South who support the Prohibition law. This not only is absurd, but is the worst form of intolerance, because the Northern intellectuals, deliberately or otherwise, fail to take into account that, save for their dryness, and, even their religious fundamentalism, such people are normal, and more often than not have performed good works. There are fanatics on both sides of the question, and it sometimes is difficult to determine which is the worse: the dry fanatic or the wet fanatic. The first usually is the worst sort of an ass, but the wet fanatic, with hardly any exception, is insincere in his wetness.

So, when we come to appraise the character and works of the representative men and women of the South, it is better to forget, for the moment, their wet or dry inclinations, and consider them in their intrinsic lights. First, it is interesting to consider the two men in the South who have been mentioned prominently in recent years for the Presidency, Oscar Underwood and Carter Glass, bearing in mind the fact that practically any man whose residence is below the Mason and Dixon line has as little chance of being nominated for that high honor as Henry L. Mencken has of being consecrated a Methodist bishop.

Underwood, next to John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, is one of the ablest men the South has ever sent to Congress. He possesses all the essential qualities of statesmanship,—wisdom, courage, equipoise, amiability and a wide knowledge of public problems and of parlia-

mentary procedure. He probably was, during his thirty odd years in Congress, as a Representative and Senator from Alabama, one of the most consistent supporters of what he conceived to be principle as opposed to expediency that the South has ever sent to Washington. He unquestionably was and still is of Presidential timber, but he rarely ever obtained more than the support of his State delegation, because he was opposed to prohibition, and because he fought the Ku Klux Klan, dangerous things to do as the representative of a State that is the hotbed of the drys and of the Kluxers. If Underwood had lived in New Jersey or New York, I believe, he would have been in the White House long ago.

As a business man in Congress, Carter Glass probably is the ablest statesman the South has produced since antebellum days. But that statement covers his case. Even so fine a piece of legislation as the Federal Reserve System, which has done more since its passage to prevent national financial panics in this country than any other agency, and therefore has served as a protection for the American people against the selfish maneuverings of the financial barons, does not remove the painful truth that Glass is not suitable for the Presidency. He is, by temperament and outlook, much like Roosevelt, but he does not possess Roosevelt's versatility. He possesses sufficient courage, but his courage is displayed after the fashion of a fox-terrier who has been wronged by a St. Bernard. Any individual who disagrees with him is an ass, no matter what his character or qualities may be. In his petulant moments,—and these come often,—Glass is a snarler.

He curves his lips and twists his cheek at an adversary, and in his heat often stoops to downright puerility. It is, of course, natural for any Southerner to want to defend his honor when it is attacked; but Glass is not content with merely defending his honor. He is ready to do battle in defending anything about himself that has been impugned, even if it is the cut of his trousers. He is pugnacious, and somewhat given to vindictiveness. Some years ago he drove out of Virginia a State veterinarian because the man had the courage to report that Glass's cows showed traces of tuberculosis. He hired his own veterinarians, who returned negative reports. A Richmond court upheld Glass and the State veterinarian lost his position when Governor Byrd went into office.

Carter Glass unquestionably is an able Senator, probably one of the ablest in the Upper House to-day. That cannot be denied. And because he is an able Senator, pepper and salt for that august body, it would be a terrible pity to send him to the White House, where his manner of doing things not only would make him extremely unpopular, but also would, in time, make him ineffectual as an executive.

As I have said, the South "killed the job" of producing great men before and during the Civil War, and no better illustration of this is to be found than in the experiences of Virginia and South Carolina. Consider Senator Claude Augustus Swanson, of Virginia, as compared with the ante-bellum statesmen of his State, and Senator Cole L. Blease, of South Carolina, as compared with the illustrious men who put that little State on the map before the Civil

War. Mr. Swanson has not been without opportunities to demonstrate the old-time Virginia statesmanship. He had fine training in the law at the University of Virginia; he became a member of Congress; he was elected Governor of the State; and after being appointed to the unexpired term of the late Senator John W. Daniel, has been elected twice to the United States Senate. There probably is no public man in the Old Dominion who has had less difficulty in obtaining the highest honors his State could bestow.

Mr. Swanson has held public offices without bringing any shame upon his State. His conduct, while Governor, during the Jamestown Exposition in 1907, however, was not calculated to accentuate the tradition of Virginia gallantry. Harry St. George Tucker, at present a representative from Virginia in Congress, was the director of the Exposition, but if he had any coöperation or encouragement from Governor Swanson during the great show, none of Mr. Tucker's friends saw any evidence of it. Indeed, the lack of coöperation and encouragement led some of Tucker's friends to believe that Claude Augustus's vanity meant as much to him, if not more, than the success of the Exposition. The big show, it must be said, failed under Mr. Tucker's management; but it was not in spite of any tremendous assistance from Mr. Swanson.

Claude Swanson is primarily a Virginia politician,—and only Virginians know what that means. He has been in his time what an old Negro once described as a "hifalutin' orator." He knows how to play upon the emotions of

Confederate veterans. He knows how to eulogize a poor fellow upon whom the grave has closed. And he is one of the last remaining statesmen who "points with pride and views with alarm." But if he has done anything constructive in Congress, outside the pork barrel sphere, the *Congressional Record*, unfortunately, doesn't record it. It is a far cry from Thomas Jefferson to Claude Augustus, a terribly far cry.

Some estimate of the character of Cole Blease of South Carolina may be drawn from the fact that the gentleman upon one occasion remarked that one could go anywhere in the world and ask, "Who is the Senator from South Carolina? And the answer would be, Cole L. Blease." Another time he called attention to the fact that he was "the only South Carolinian who has been mayor of his city, Senator from his county, Speaker of the House, president of the State Senate, Governor of the State and United States Senator; also the only one who has represented three of the State fraternal bodies in national grand bodies." One must confess that is an extraordinary record for one man. It transcends in volume the honors which have come to Chief Justice Taft, the only man who has held the two highest offices in the land.

The best estimate of Mr. Blease's character and outlook on life must be drawn from the time he began campaigning for Governor for the first time in 1910. He openly appealed to the ignorant class in the State. He attacked the South Carolina Supreme Court; took a violent fling at the General Assembly; and, as if seeking new worlds to conquer, aimed his artillery at the Federal

Government. After he had become Governor the Legislature passed more measures over his veto than any other body of lawmakers in America has ever been known to do. At a conference of Governors of Southern States in Richmond in 1912, he openly advocated lynching, emulating a candidate for Governor in Mississippi some years ago, who made lynching a part of his platform. Blease's violent advocacy of the unwritten law apparently made him sympathetic with criminals who had been punished after due process of law, so he pardoned and paroled approximately 1,500 of them while he was Governor. In 1918 he prosecuted a campaign for the United States Senate on a platform opposing America's entry into the war and, of course, was defeated, because South Carolinians like nothing better in the world than participating in a first-rate war. That was one time when he miscalculated. He ought to have confined his campaign to lynching and he would have been sure of success. It is a far cry from John C. Calhoun to Coleman L. Blease, an exceedingly far cry.

Next to Cole Blease, James K. Vardaman of Mississippi probably is one of the most unrepresentative types of Southern statesmanship, with Senator Pat Harrison of the same State and Senator Thomas D. Heflin of Alabama following closely behind. Born in Texas in the heat of July weather while the Civil War was at its height, it was but natural probably that Mr. Vardaman should become a fiery-mannered, lion-hearted disputant. Throughout his career he was notable for being "agin" all things that most normal persons are for, and in this he gave Mr.

Blease a run for his money. Vardaman is probably a stronger man than Pat Harrison, but the latter has the distinction of having at least meant well even when he was at the height of his puerility in Congress.

A distinguished advocate of lynching, it was but natural for Mr. Vardaman to oppose a visit to his excellent State by the late Col. Theodore Roosevelt because the latter had had Booker T. Washington as his dinner guest in the White House. That was when the long-haired silver-tongued Mississippian was Governor of his commonwealth. But it was not until World War days and post-war days that he distinguished himself as a bitter opponent of Woodrow Wilson and all his policies. His opposition probably was matched nowhere in the Democratic party in its bitterness and vigor, unless it was in the person of the hot-headed Senator Jim Reed of Missouri. Like Blease, Vardaman miscalculated, and in 1918 Pat Harrison defeated him for the United States Senate in a hotly contested election, the principle issue being Vardaman's opposition to the Wilsonian war policies. In Congress Vardaman, with his long hair and Websterian demeanor, made a gallant figure. But in Congress nowadays it is not so much how a man appears as what he says, and Vardaman was forever saying things that sounded exceedingly harsh to old-fashioned Democratic ears.

The best that can be said for the Hon. Byron Patton Harrison, member of the United States Senate from Mississippi, is that he is altogether harmless. If he had the brains and talents that Jim Reed of Missouri possesses he would, without doubt, be a menace to right-mindedness

in Congress; but, fortunately, his colleagues pay little heed to his observations on public questions. A refreshing thing about Harrison's utterances, it must be said to his credit, is that they are occasionally flavored with the kind of wit that made Uncle Remus famous. Perhaps his real forte is that of the teaser and jokester; but the difficulty is in determining when the Mississippian intends to be serious. I almost forgot to mention the fact that both Vardaman and Harrison are members of the Methodist Episcopal church, but I have been informed by persons supposed to know that their membership has been more or less turned over to proxies in recent years, although both men adhere to the strict tenets of fundamentalism in all matters pertaining to God and man, save probably in the case of taking the name of God in vain.

Senator J. Thomas Heflin, as an orator, is more like Vardaman than any other Southern representative in Congress at this writing. It might be safe to say that he is a bit more blatant than Vardaman and far more intolerant. If his colleagues in Congress, for example, were to take him seriously, Heflin would be leading another crusade to Rome, where he would drive the Pontiff from the Vatican and establish in its stead the noble Methodist hierarchy. Whether or not he really subscribes to the views and opinions on public questions which he voices vigorously from time to time in Congress, no man can say, for no man save Heflin himself knows what is in his mind, or in his gizzard, as the case may be. But in our brief history as a Republic it is doubtful whether any member of Congress from any State in the Union has done so much to try to

stir up religious strife as the Hon. J. Thomas Heflin. Fortunately, thinking people in his own section of the country do not take him seriously when he launches upon an attack on the Catholic church; but there are many constituents in Alabama and many persons in other sections of the South who are inflamed by such onslaughts, and Heflin's work can hardly go unnoticed by students of public affairs. If his heart and brain were as big as his voice, Alabama would at this writing have one of the ablest representatives in Congress; but nature is slighting in her dispensations.

Next to Oscar Underwood, Joseph T. Robinson, member of the Senate from Arkansas, is one of the ablest representatives the South has had in Congress in recent years. Slightly more hot-headed than the Alabaman, Robinson is, nevertheless, a man of calm judgment, consistent in his advocacy of Democratic measures and a statesman who leans on the side of progressiveness. A trained lawyer and a man of wide experience in public affairs, he is, at this writing, probably one of the ablest parliamentarians in the Upper House of Congress.

Senator Thaddeus H. Caraway is a gentleman of altogether another stripe. He might be termed the Pat Harrison of Arkansas, although I imagine that such a characterization would be fighting talk if voiced within the reach of Caraway's belligerent fists. Mr. Caraway's observations on public questions, and particularly his attacks on his Republican opponents, might easily serve for the *leitmotif* of the "Slow Train Through Arkansas." A Caraway speech gives one the impression of a lazy, in-

different Arkansas mountaineer laughing up his sleeve. I really doubt whether the Senator takes anything seriously. Mr. Caraway's statesmanship consists in making people laugh at his homely sayings which have a Will Rogers flavor and a Mark Twain wisdom. He is a delightful after-dinner talker, but hardly of great importance as a before-Congress talker.

The two grand old men among the Southern representatives in Congress who demonstrate more than any others how a State rewards faithful service are Senators Lee S. Overman and Furnifold McL. Simmons, of North Carolina. Both men have slipped by the three-score and ten mile-post by two or three years. Both have been in the Senate for more than a quarter of a century; and it probably is safe to say that they could remain there as long as life is in their bodies. No two men in Congress are better posted on the technique and art of pork barrel politics than these venerable statesmen; but it would be unfair to let their case rest with such an observation. Senator Simmons, it should be said to his credit, held the important post of Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee throughout Woodrow Wilson's two terms; and if one desires to know the quality of the North Carolinian's statesmanship one has but to consult the *Congressional Record* for the years 1913-1919 inclusive, where one will find some constructive governmental financing, in an unprecedented emergency, which has not been matched, and probably never will be matched in this generation. It is noteworthy that these two aged Senators represent a State that is administered by young men; and since the

year 1910 North Carolina has passed more constructive legislation than any other State in the South. Overman and Simmons, in their younger days, probably would not have been of Presidential timber; but, to their credit, it must be said that they have served their State in Congress in a way that is remindful of ante-bellum statesmanship, in their dignity, in their constructiveness and in their insight into the needs of their people. Their names should go down in North Carolina history as two noble old Romans who thought more of deeds than oratory.

An anomaly among the Southern representatives in Congress is Senator Duncan U. Fletcher, of Florida. At this writing he is, as far as I have been able to learn, the only Southern member of Congress who does not belong to the Protestant fold or who is not affiliated indirectly with that fold. Mr. Fletcher, of all things in the South, is a Unitarian. This would not be unusual if the man were a native of New England, where intellectuality is measured by the square feet. But Mr. Fletcher is a native of Sumter county, Georgia, where in so far as Unitarians are concerned there "ain't no such animal." The church census of 1916 discloses that there were in the South but 1,947 Unitarians, and these were confined to five of the eleven former Confederate States, with North Carolina's 994 in the lead. The States where Unitarians were to be found in 1916 were Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia,—with nary a one in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina! How Mr. Fletcher came to be a Unitarian in these circumstances is hard to understand in the first place, but how

he succeeded in winning a Senatorial election is a greater puzzle. The only clew I see is that the Senator's late father was Captain Thomas Jefferson Fletcher, and there's magic in the name. Another strange thing is that in the land which is opposed to monkey-ancestors, Mr. Fletcher at one time was the chairman of a county board of public instruction; and I wonder what the good fundamentalists were thinking about when they let him slip through with a textbook in one hand and a tract by Joseph Priestley in the other. Maybe, after all, Florida has seceded from the Solid South. On the other hand, a balance is to be found in the fact that Senator Park Trammell is a good Baptist.

One of the ablest Congressmen Georgia has sent to Washington in recent years is Senator Walter F. George. By training a skilled lawyer and by instinct and experience an able jurist, Senator George is far above the thoughts and opinions of his constituency. For five years he was an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia; and a man can hardly remain on such a tribunal for half a decade without adopting the practice of weighing all controversial questions impartially and judicially. The result is that Senator George while not going over tooth and toe-nail to the protectionists, realizes that Southern industry must get away from its free trade ideas and adopt, in some measure, the protective tariff principle, if it hopes to compete with Northern industry. In a speech before the Southern Society in New York in the Winter of 1926, he declared that the South "needs reasonable protection to industry," a statement that amounts to heresy in the land of the Klan and the lyncher's tar pot. Time un-

questionably will prove that the Senator is right, although it will be painful to Southerners to surrender to a policy which they have hated with a vengeance for more than a hundred years. The only alternative they have is to place the whole country on a free trade basis or adopt for the whole country a tariff for revenue only; but such a thing is impossible as long as the South maintains its political solidarity.

In so far as Southerners are concerned the greatest distinction that attaches to Senator William Julius Harris of Georgia, is the fact that he married the daughter of the late General Joseph Wheeler of Alabama, a gallant Confederate officer. Such an alliance is in itself enough to make the South consider Senator Harris as among the Romans who deserve to wear the laurel; but Mr. Harris has had experience in the Federal service, which enables him to serve his State more or less capably. In 1913 to 1915 inclusive, he was director of the United States census; and from 1915 to 1918 he was a member of the Federal Trade Commission. A banker by profession, he is somewhat the Carter Glass of Georgia, but lacking the Virginian's fiery temperament.

When Roosevelt split the Republican party in 1912, a large number of Southern Republicans flocked to the Progressive banner; but it was not until 1916 that the Democrats began to take notice of the new party, and this was because they were opposed to President Wilson's so-called failure up to that time to prepare the country for war. The most conspicuous Southern Democrats who turned Progressive were Senator Edwin S. Broussard of

Louisiana, who at this writing holds his Senatorial post as a Democrat, and Governor John M. Parker, who when this was written was a Democratic governor of Louisiana. A grimly humorous thing about Broussard and Parker going over to the Progressive party in 1916 on the non-preparedness issue, was the fact that the National Progressive platform in 1912 contained a very peaceful stipulation for the limitation of armaments. In 1916 Broussard was candidate for lieutenant-governor on the Progressive ticket and Parker was the Progressive nominee for vice-president. Their political judgment proved poor, because by the time the 1916 campaign had gotten under way the Progressive party disintegrated, a large number of Progressives having reunited with the Republican party because of dissatisfaction with Mr. Wilson's war policies. Both Broussard and Parker have been forgiven in Louisiana, and are Democrats in good standing, although their fellow Democrats in the northern tier of Southern States look upon them as traitors. The attitude that Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi displayed toward Senator Wheeler when he followed the La Follette camp in 1924, typifies the feeling of most Southerners toward men who they consider have traitorously deserted the party.

John M. Parker, whether he was a political traitor or not, unquestionably is one of the outstanding business men of the South. As president, in turn, of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, the Southern Commercial Congress and the Mississippi Valley Association, he has done as much as any other one man during the past thirty years to pro-

mote the South's industrial and agricultural growth. He is an able man, and the South probably would be better off if more men of his political independence and ability and courage ruled her politics. Both Broussard and Parker visualize the new South as she must be if she hopes to compete in a business way with the North. They do not let sentiment and traditions prevent them from seeing the inevitable economic needs of their native land, whatever her political tenets may be.

Like Senator Wesley L. Jones, of the State of Washington, Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, is best known outside his home State as one of the Senate's most vigorous dry advocates. Mr. Sheppard, or rather Dr. Sheppard, for he is an LL.D., comes by this naturally. Born in the Lone Star State, reared in a Methodist home and graduated from the Southern Methodist University, he is a typical Southern Democratic Methodist. To conceive of such a man being an anti-prohibitionist, would be to conceive of the angel Michael following the cohorts of Satan when the latter battled with the Lord's hosts in the clouds. Such a status ruins Mr. Sheppard with the "wets" in the country, but the fact is that he is an able, honest and courageous representative of his State in the National Upper House. His father before him was a member of Congress, so he is a trained parliamentarian. His worst mistakes in Congress probably have been prompted by his too ready a leaning on the side of what he conceives to be "law and order," a well-known fetish of the Methodist brethren. His colleague, Senator Earle Bradford Mayfield, is a Methodist, and a thirty-second degree

Mason, so the dry South could hardly expect a better equipment of a man born in Texas, unless it is the ability to use the rope and ride a wild horse.

Senator Kenneth Douglas McKellar, of Tennessee, bears a name that sounds as if he might have come from the Scotch Highlands, but he first saw the light of day in the hills of Dallas county, Alabama, between the Tombigbee and Alabama rivers. It was natural for him to stick to the river, so he made his headquarters at Memphis, Tennessee, where he has had a successful political career in so far as holding office is concerned. In Congress, however, he has not been outstanding, and the best that can be said for him is that he has gone along with his party satisfactorily when the occasion demanded.

His colleague, Senator Lawrence D. Tyson, is an altogether different type of man. A native of North Carolina, and a graduate of the United States Military Academy, he has played a prominent part in our army activities. He served in the Spanish-American War, and as the commander of a brigade in France helped the French to break the famous Hindenburg line in the Somme sector. When he was not fighting Germans or Spaniards, or legislators in the old days when the lawmaking bodies named the United States Senators, he was engaged in the coal and iron business successfully. Senator Tyson is said to be a level-headed, and mayhap, a hard-headed member of the Senate. He is one Southerner who is not likely to let the pacifists sweep the country clean of its defenses, if he can do anything to prevent it.

Cole Blease's activities in South Carolina have been so

startling that many persons outside that State have overlooked the work of Senator Ellison D. Smith. Mr. Smith probably is one of the best posted men in the South on the subject of cotton. He is a genuine dirt farmer, and in 1901 organized the Farmers' Protective Association. In 1905 he started a movement which led to the organization of the Southern Cotton Association, one of the most influential business organizations in the South. If former Governor Lowden, of Illinois, or Arthur Capper, of Kansas, think they know anything about the problem of farm relief, without having consulted with Senator Smith, of South Carolina, they have made a serious mistake. He is one man in Congress who can give them valuable pointers.

To sum up, the South has been fairly well represented for the past thirty years; but on the whole, as I have pointed out, her statesmanship is at a low ebb compared with ante-bellum days. Nevertheless her Senators compare favorably with Senators from other States in the Union.

CHAPTER XIV

TYPES

Whether or not the Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution has affected the caliber of men who have been sent to the United States Senate is debatable. The Amendment was adopted in 1913, and prior to that time United States Senators were chosen by the State legislatures. In the South an election by a Democratic legislative caucus was equivalent to election. But the same thing works out in the popular vote, for election in a Democratic primary likewise is equivalent to election. And the truth probably is that machine politics rules the election as vigorously as it used to rule the choices of the legislatures, so that it is doubtful whether the adoption of the Seventeenth Amendment has lowered the quality of Senatorial representation in the South or affected it at all, for that matter. The quality, though, unquestionably has been lowered, as I have attempted to point out, by the South's political solidarity since the Civil War.

Politics, in the same manner, has affected the caliber of State and city officials and members of the legislatures; but there has been in the South a notable exception, and that has been in the judiciary. In most of the Southern States the jurists are chosen by the legislatures, and while politics figure in their selections to some extent, the men chosen are on the whole of high character and usually

of more than average ability. This is particularly true of men who are elevated to the appellate tribunals.

Municipal heads, including mayors and city managers and city commissioners are, as everywhere else, ruled by machine politics. In those cities where the commission form of government exists, politics is not as sharply defined as in the city where the mayoralty system holds sway. In practically every Southern city is to be found a central political clique which rules the destinies of the city. Again an individual is boss. Or a wealthy citizen whose generosity has been largely responsible for the city's growth and development is the boss. In these matters Southern communities are not unlike those in the North. I dare say that in every city in the South of 75,000 population or more there is a political organization as formidable as Tammany Hall in its machine rule, and in its ability to take care of its political friends.

At random, one can pick up a daily newspaper in any Southern community and find editorial or reader complaints against the sins of commission or omission of the political machine. Such complaints are typical of all American towns and cities. The South, of course, has been and promises to continue to be in a more lasting grip of the "machines" because of its political solidarity.

The average Southern mayor is a weak vessel, subject to the beck and call of the unscrupulous politicians. This is not true of city managers who usually are engineers with training and long technical experience, but the city managers, unfortunately, often are hedged in by the whims of political-minded commissioners. In the South to-day I

do not believe that the old-time game of graft is played in the administration of State and municipal affairs, as many persons suspect. Under the bicameral form of government there was a time when councilmen and aldermen figured in graft manipulations connected with city contracts. Such things are not done now because the people,—and the newspapers,—are watching the administration of their States and communities too closely. Sharp practices, of course, are indulged in, and the old pastime of beating the devil around the bush and dodging laws in devious ways are still prevalent in the South as they are in the North.

In pre-prohibition days the underworld consisted of women who plied the ancient trade and gamblers, and in communities where segregated districts were prohibited the women paid their tributes to the police. To-day the underworld not only consists of the painted women and gamblers but of bootleggers as well, and those police who receive tributes from the underworld now get most of it from the vendors of illicit liquor. To the credit of the authorities it must be said that they are constantly weeding from the police forces men who accept bribes and hand-outs, but in some communities tributes have been known to go to officials from the highest to the lowest, so that little could be done to apprehend them. It should be remembered that bribery, as conducted by bootleggers nowadays, is not the crude affair that it was in the good old days when the Tweed Ring was at the height of its power. Bootleggers are artistic. They use finesse. They know how to pay tribute without the tribute having the

appearance of a tribute, going upon the theory that there are more ways than one of killing a cat.

In some communities arch-bootleggers have been known to rule the political affairs of the people by holding in their hands the power of patronage. And an arch-bootlegger, it should be remembered, is no rude peddler. Usually he is to the illicit liquor trade, what Raffles was to burglary. He moves in the best of company; and his confidants are to be found among gentlemen in the town who bear the dubious term, "prominent citizen."

Probably in no sphere of public life has the quality of citizenship fallen to such a low ebb since the Civil War as among the members of State legislatures. There is an excellent reason for this. The able, honest men in the South are unwilling to waste their valuable time in the State legislative halls. The result is that the skimmed milk of society pours to the capitals of the commonwealths as Senators and Representatives, including ignorant fishermen on the coasts and mountaineers who never saw an elevator until they were elected to the General Assembly. But, the South is not notable in this respect. In the North, East and West, too, are to be found legislators of the same caliber. An excellent example of this was the General Assembly in the State of Delaware in 1927. That intellectual body passed two or three important measures, and a dozen or more of the members were so unaware of having voted for the bills, that after the bills reached the Governor's desk and the legislators learned what they had done, they appealed to the executive to veto the very measures they had voted for. While I know of no such

stupidity in the South, experience has proved that Southern legislators in the past have been quite capable of such tactics. The freak bills that come before Southern law-making bodies usually are written by ignorant, unskilled members whose only claim to statesmanship is that the male members of their families for three or four generations back have voted the Democratic ticket without a break. Members of Congress on the whole are not greatly different from State legislators, but some of them are men of ability and integrity.

Southern women in recent years have attempted to improve local political conditions, but they have failed in the South as they have everywhere else because their political actions ultimately are guided by sentiment and not by reason. It has been the experience, in the South, too, that many women have followed the lead of their menfolk in political matters. The result has been that the women merely have swelled the electorate without improving its intellectual quality. Women's clubs in some communities have striven vigorously and earnestly to improve the political affairs in their town, city or State, but invariably they have found themselves confronted with political problems they can't solve and with shrewd politicians who make them believe the problems are being solved when they are not. Some of the more intelligent women have seen what actually was happening, and have been content with staging entertainment programs, adopting ineffectual resolutions and bringing paid lecturers to town and letting their political activities go hang.

The South, with just pride, points to such men as John

Marshall, Patrick Henry, Chief Justice White and others of similar legal ability as representative of what the South is capable of producing at the bar. But, save in a few rare instances, the great mold must have been broken long ago. The law schools in the colleges and universities in the South are largely responsible for the running over in most of the towns and cities of pseudo-lawyers. Young men whose temperaments and talents better fit them for the plow, the anvil, the butcher's stall, the football field and the insurance office, stage the bum's rush to the court houses, bearing the dubious label "attorney-at-law." The result is that the quality of the Southern legal practitioner has fallen off tremendously, and the legal code of ethics has suffered, as well. The old time ambulance chaser would have something to learn from the sharp practitioners who grace the courts and the police headquarters with their learning in the South nowadays. Fortunately, quite a large number of young would-be professionals become store clerks and movie theater ushers,—and Marshall and Henry must kick up the dust in the bottom of their graves.

Southern merchants and bankers compare favorably with those in the other parts of the Union. They use the latest business methods, they keep in touch with the latest methods of their fellow merchants and bankers in the North, and the result is that Southern communities provide some of the finest business houses, stores and financial institutions to be found in the land. The three men who had as much to do with the authorship and passage of the bill creating the Federal Reserve System were South-

erners, and all from the same town, namely, Carter Glass, Robert L. Owen and Samuel Untermyer. This trio are products of the little town of Lynchburg, Virginia, where a certain Judge Charles Lynch established a practice in Revolutionary days which many Southerners follow to this day. Mr. Glass, it must be added, however, was the only one of the three who remained in the South. And the first governor of the Federal Reserve Board was a Southerner, namely, William P. G. Harding, of Alabama. Another Alabaman, Oscar Wells, recently was president of the American Bankers' Association.

Among the merchants, some of the most successful operators of department stores have been Jews. This is particularly true of the large cities in the South. And there is not a community in the South of 50,000 population or more that hasn't one or more wholesale grocery houses, operated along modern lines. These houses are among the most progressive in the country. It might be said of the Southern merchants and bankers that they are altogether as business-like and shrewd as the Northerners, and that they have been responsible, in large measure, for the growth and development of the South since the Civil War.

The laboring class in the South is of a much higher order than the same class in the North. This is because the Southerners are almost entirely free of the foreign element which in recent years has given the Northern trade unions so much trouble. It is a mistake, however, to believe that the trade unionists in the South are solid politically. They are affiliated with the dominant polit-

ical parties, but are to be found in greater numbers in the Democratic organization. The strongest race feeling in the Southern States is between the laboring class of white men and the blacks. This is not hard to understand when it is considered that many of the whites, particularly in the unskilled field, are required to work shoulder to shoulder with the Negroes, and sometimes compete with them. The same race feeling, however, prevails in the North where the laboring class is involved.

The white trade unionists in the South are probably more influenced by outside agitators than the unionists in the North, but only so long as they believe that the agitator is working solely in their interests. Once they suspect that he is not honest, even toward their opponents, they are quick to get rid of him. The result is that there have been many labor disturbances in the South, but none that has been as serious as those which have been staged in the North. A factor which has served largely to prevent serious labor troubles in the South has been the provision for better housing facilities for employees by large corporations and an improvement in their community life. Workers would prefer to remain in comfortable quarters, surrounded by modern community accommodations rather than jeopardize their interests by quibbling with their employers or striking over the question of hours or a few cents difference in pay.

In what is generally termed the "working class" in the South, it should be remembered that there are various types. There is the cattleman on the Texas plains, the lumberman and mountaineer in the mountains of Vir-

ginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Arkansas and West Virginia, cotton pickers in the Mississippi valley, fishermen along the rivers, along the coast and on the gulf, miners in the coal and ore mines and trappers and hunters. Each of these types has his individual customs, and his individual outlook on life. Much has been written about the hardy Texan plainsmen, but I believe the most interesting type of human being below the Mason and Dixon line to-day is the Southern mountaineer in Virginia, North Carolina and Kentucky.

In the Blue Ridge mountains of Virginia, within half a day's walk of the University, there is a race of white people that still retain many of the customs of their pioneer ancestors. Some of these people came from England, others from Scotland, and among them the ancient way of preparing food prevails. They wear the same kind of clothes, more or less, that their forebears of four or five generations ago wore. They have many of the ancient superstitions. They believe in "spells" and witches and "hants." Many of them resort to mysterious charms and spell chasers. Some years ago a young mountaineer, fifty miles north of Charlottesville, Virginia, was seized with a "spell," and after the medicine men of the mountains had worked on him unsuccessfully for weeks, he was taken to the University Hospital. There he remained for many days in a semi-coma, apparently helpless and lifeless. The best doctors in the vicinity and from Richmond were called in to examine him. They were unable to diagnose his case. They were agreed that he was not simulating illness nor pretending that a spell had

seized him. Frankly, they didn't know what was the matter with him. They were unable to release him from the "spell." After a time he was returned to the mountains, and there an old mountain woman relieved him of his devils, or whatever he had, for the sum of \$5.00. It is not known what system she used. The story of this young man can be authenticated.

The mountaineers, the fishermen and trappers are the most isolated types in the South, and for that reason are the most ignorant. The fishermen and trappers in the river country are of the nomadic bent. They live on the rivers or in the swamps for months at a time, fishing and hunting in the proper seasons. Some of these men have their headquarters in villages where their womenfolk, if they have any, wait for them through the fishing and hunting seasons, while they roam over large areas. On the coast the fisherman is a home lover and rarely ever gets far away from the little cottage that houses his family.

The mountaineers and the trappers have little regard for the man-made laws which happen to affect their particular business. The trapper will poach, as does the hunter, while the mountaineer makes his moonshine whiskey with the same nonchalance that his pioneer forebears made it. In his opinion, an opinion which he held in pre-prohibition days when the revenue officers pursued him for revenue only, the making of liquor is an inherent right with which neither man nor Government has any right to interfere. I dare say that when the last horn is blown for the quick and the dead, a Southern mountaineer will be found standing guard at his faithful still, hidden in a

ravine near a mountain stream that carries to the deep valley below the hint of something that is not allowed by law.

The expansion of railroads through the South has produced types that are playing a prominent part in the industrial life of the section. In the early days of railroading, the ablest rail executives necessarily came from the North, and this was true of many of the civil engineers. As the carriers grew, and as the lines were extended, there came about a change. Native sons rose to eminence in the railroad field, and some of the best railroad men in the country to-day are Southerners. The late Milton H. Smith, of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, is a notable example, and William J. Harahan, president of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, is another. Such men usually start their careers in minor positions and work through all the grades of service before they reach the top. When Milton Smith was in his prime the Louisville & Nashville was one of the best managed railroads in the South. The late John Howe Peyton, president of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, not only was one of the finest railroad executives in the country, but was one of the finest characters. In his brief lifetime,—he died at the age of 44,—he devoted much of his time and money to the training and education of young men, and many men now high up in the service of some of the leading railroads in the South owe their start to his generosity.

The South, like the North, has provided its quota of wealthy laymen who participate actively in the affairs of

their churches. There are among these some fine men, but there are, too, the proverbial hypocrites, ranging from the kind who pass the plate on the Sunday and pass the buck to the devil during the week, to the kind who cries "Amen" sonorously in the front bench every Sabbath, and mulcts widows and orphans of their rightful holdings on week-days. The South is not peculiar in its laymen of these types. They are to be found everywhere; but probably in the South they have a better opportunity to hide their iniquity. Their ability to fool some of the folk all the time, which is one of Mr. Lincoln's characterizations of men, is given freer play in the South because of the great strength of Protestantism. The rich man who can provide the lucre possesses a special privilege at the hands of the brethren, and apparently at the hands of the Almighty, although there are some in their own flocks, who doubt whether the Almighty would be lenient in the circumstances. Then, there are the lay preacher and lay reader. The lay preacher usually is a suave, white cravatted gentleman who shaves paper during the week and shaves the beard off St. Luke on Sunday in so far as he interprets that writer of one of the Gospels. He attends the State and general conferences, and to all intents and purposes is a "very good man, a very good man, indeed," but if there is a devil, as the fundamentalists say, he is peeping around the corner and grinning with satisfaction. Each village, town and city in the South has its notables of this character; but the same thing is true of practically every village, town and city in the Union.

Each community has its crusading minister, and some-

times two of them. This gentleman sees to it that all the dens of vice are destroyed, that all the painted ladies are herded out of town, that all the blind tigers are closed up and sealed, that the gamblers are rounded up and required to leave before sundown, or sunup as the case may be, and that nothing more sinful than riding in an automobile to church be indulged in on the Sabbath. He is what might be termed a super-fundamentalist. What he usually accomplishes in the village, town or city, where his light is not hid under a bushel, is to obtain volumes of publicity, get all the righteous folk stirred up, leave town in a blaze of glory, for some other town, and at the same time leave the town in *status quo*. It is only fair to state that this type of brother is not confined to the South, as the experience of cities in the East will disclose, including the wicked city of New York. In a certain community not far from New York, in 1925, a minister of the gospel led a squad of police into a gambling den, accompanied them to a blind tiger and did general police work, until duty called him to another town. The South is far from being peculiar in this respect.

In the larger Southern communities are to be found the public letter-writing hound, that is to say, the gentleman or lady who rushes into print on any and every occasion to air his or her views in a local newspaper. Some towns possess as many as half a dozen of these folk; but the average newspaper counts on one man to do the work of setting the community,—the world at large,—and the newspapers,—right when they err. Such a person, more

times than not, is harmless, and furnishes the daily sheet something to write an editorial about when it has run out of subjects. Humorists and cartoonists have pictured the cross-roads rube as a gentleman who is more than ready to furnish the President of the United States good advice on how to shape his foreign affairs or how to lay down his domestic policies, whether they have to do with sending the Marines to Nicaragua or lowering the tariff on sugar. But the prince of them all is the public letter hound in a town of 50,000 persons in the South. I know of one newspaper which has been receiving at least one letter a week and sometimes two from a gentleman who is now beyond the eightieth mile-post, and he began writing public letters before many of the present generation were in their swaddling clothes.

In the larger cities in the South Negro merchants, bankers and professionals are to be found in small numbers. Their business is confined to persons of their own race. In some communities Negro merchants do business with the very low class of white people who go by the significant name of "poor white trash." Such whites often live in Negro sections, and their economic status is hardly higher than that of the lowest class of Negroes. Some of the best type of Negroes in the cities engage in the barbering trade; and there are white men in the South who will not patronize a white barber shop when they can find a competent Negro barber to cut their hair or shave them. Negro bankers who meet with any success at all are highly successful and usually engage in extensive real estate operations along with their regular bank-

ing business. The result is that rows of small homes in the Negro quarters of many of the Southern cities fall into the hands of Negro bankers. Such properties, together with the same type of property owned by the whites, offer the worst environments to be found in the South to-day. They are dilapidated, unsanitary and in a general need of repairs. The difficulty of attempting to maintain better quarters in these sections is that their occupants usually are transients who are here to-day and gone to-morrow and are indifferent to the condition of their quarters.

Among the most intelligent Negroes are those who go into the homes as butlers, those who serve as attendants in the clubs, and janitors in the large apartment buildings and business houses. These men are trustworthy and in many ways are like their ante-bellum forebears in their respectful attitude toward the whites. The Negroes in the South, like those in the North, however, are shunning domestic services as much as economic conditions will permit them, so that the old-time servant is almost a type of the past. The happiest Negro in the South to-day probably is found along the river fronts, on the wharves on the coast, in the cotton fields, on the railroad section forces, on the farms and in various spheres of industrial activity. Life to them is of to-day; to-morrow is something that rarely concerns them; and no sorrow or adversity is quite capable of darkening the bright hopefulness that makes them nothing more than carefree children.

A noteworthy influence on community life in some sections of the South to-day is the Northerner who has

migrated below the Mason and Dixon line. Unlike his "carpet-bagger" predecessor, he usually is a wealthy man who finds in the South the climate, scenery and environment which appeals to him as a home site. If he is a business man, as he often is, he brings to the South Northern methods and ideas which sooner or later find their way, in some measure, into the life of the community in which he lives. Railroads and industrial concerns in recent years have called for the services of Northerners. An example of this is the Norfolk and Western Railroad, with headquarters in the city of Roanoke, Virginia. Almost since the organization of that road the high officials, and particularly the presidents, have been Northern men, trained in their early years in the service of Northern or Western railroads. The city of Roanoke, which at this writing has a population of 65,000, was built up around the Norfolk & Western Railway, and because the road is practically a subsidiary of the Pennsylvania Railroad, it has drawn hundreds, possibly thousands of employees from the North, principally from the State of Pennsylvania. The result is that Roanoke has a large number of natives of the North in its citizenry; and it might be added that the town is probably the most progressive in Virginia, when its age is considered, and one of the most progressive in the South. The town is typical of the way in which Northern capital and Northern management have played potent parts in the development of the South.

The Northerners who migrate South usually are members of the Republican party and retain much of their

loyalty to the North, but as years pass they assimilate the Southern traditions and ideals, and their children are as loyal to the South, in time, as are the children of the natives.

The most notable case of Northern migration to the South is the State of Florida. That State in recent years has drawn so many persons from sections other than the South, that it can hardly be termed strictly a Southern commonwealth of the old order. This is certainly true of the coastal regions where Winter resorts to-day have become the playgrounds of the wealthy families of the East and North. At this writing, Florida has not been changed materially in a political way by the influx of Northerners, but a revolutionary change in this respect in a few years would not be surprising. Indeed, such a change might easily be the entering wedge which might make way for the breaking up of the South's political solidarity.

CHAPTER XV

LITERATURE

Before the Civil War, and for twenty years after the war there was a distinctive type of prose and poetry that had to do with the romantic story of the Southern people. This distinctive Southern literature continued until about the time the World War broke out. Then there came a change after the war; and to-day the Southern writers of prominence are not different in their technique and philosophies from writers in other parts of America. They have joined the great herd of litterateurs who are contributing to that indefinable thing called American literature. Some of them, it is true, are attempting to picture the local scene and local customs and manners, but in doing so they are necessarily paying tribute to the new type of literature.

Dr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Gilmour professor of language and literature at Liverpool University, some years ago, defined the general term literature as "the best expression of the best thought reduced to writing"; but he admitted that literature's various forms are the "result of race peculiarities, or of diverse individual temperaments, or of political circumstances securing the predominance of one social class which is thus able to propagate its ideas and sentiments." There has been a revolutionary change since Dr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly made this observation, and

the change is probably more pronounced in the South to-day than anywhere else in America. The change is the inevitable working of evolution and was bound to come, just as the transformation in our forms of literature after the World War were inevitable.

In considering the literature of the South to-day, one cannot, in the circumstances, consider it from a standpoint of sectionalism, but from an omnipotently American standpoint. James Branch Cabell, considered by the intellectuals as one of America's leading writers to-day, is not applauded as a Southerner, but as an American. One critic has described him as the "South's foremost citizen," a characterization that would naturally come from a critic who is a writer himself. It would be just as natural for a railroad man to call William J. Harahan, president of the Chesapeake and Ohio railroad, the "South's leading citizen," or for a member of the legal profession to speak of Justice Martin Burke, of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, the Southland's foremost citizen. It depends upon one's individual interests and tastes, and it also depends upon one's conception of the definition of literature. In the circumstances, literature would have to be the South's greatest field of human endeavor before it could be said that James Branch Cabell, or any other writer, is the South's leading citizen.

Nevertheless, Cabell probably is the South's leading writer. He has undoubtedly contributed a new type of romanticism to the literature of to-day, and as a writer, his fame is not confined to the South, or to America. His works are read throughout the civilized world. But, save

among a small group of intellectuals in the South, Cabell's works are not understood there. The average man or woman in the South knows not an iota what "Jurgen" is all about, so that he does not read Cabell's books. The ordinary business man in the South would suffer from a cracking of the brain if he would attempt to comprehend the subtleties of "Jurgen," so it is but natural that he and his wife turn to the lighter works of Ellen Glasgow, Mary Johnston, Corra Harris, Amelie P. Troubetzkoy, Kate Langley Bosher, Beatrice W. Ravenel, Armistead C. Gordon, Thomas Dixon and others, not to mention the irrepressible Mr. Octavus Roy Cohen, of *Saturday Evening Post* fame.

It will be noted that all the writers thus far named, save Cabell, have laid the scenes of their stories in the Southland and that save in the case of Cohen, they have gone through a literary evolution which has made their work a far different thing from what it was fifteen or twenty years ago. The most notable example is Ellen Glasgow. No writer in the South has pictured with greater accuracy the morals and manners of her people; but her earlier books were purely romantic. To-day she is a realist who takes her place beside the leading realists of America.

Mary Johnston's historical novels possess the same romantic motif. No writer in America possesses a greater genius for weaving out of the facts of history a romantic story of vigor and color. But Mary Johnston, of late, has been turning her eyes toward the bench where the American realists are sitting. Some years ago she startled her

fellow Southerners by writing a beautiful tribute to Virginia in Whitman-like free verse. As beautiful as this poem is, it must have pained many of the old-fashioned admirers of her earlier works. An indefatigable digger for historical facts and an untiring writer, she has won deserved fame, and for years was a neck and a head in advance of her rival, Ellen Glasgow. This stirred up Miss Glasgow's dander and she went to work with the determination to outdistance her fellow novelist. The best known critics declare that her recent books have entitled her to the laurels. The time was in the South when the romanticists confined their heroisms to the aristocratic class. Miss Glasgow was guilty of this herself in her early books. But she got away from it, and saw what few Southerners saw at the time—the coming of a new type of Southerner. She visualized the rise of the middle and lower classes in the South to places of power. And her later works have been about the struggles and attainments of these people. Surrendering to the school of realists she has within the past ten years written books of real power and beauty. Some of her old-time admirers will regret a certain cynicism and fatalism which have crept into her works of late, but they might have suspected that she would come to this when they read "The Voice of the People." Miss Glasgow is a progressive. She is one of those rare types of present-day Southerner who possess the ineffable personal charm of an ancient era, combined with the fresh outlook of the modernist.

In literature Corra Harris is something of a phenomenon. I leave it to critics of wider psychological and

philosophical powers to determine exactly what her place is in American literature. Suffice it to say that no male writer in the South has greater vigor or finer perceptions of the truths of life. The Protestant South, it should be remembered, is the dominant force, so that when Corra Harris, one time a circuit rider's wife, paints intimate pictures of the early days of Protestantism in the South, the days when the devil was really a devil and when hell was really a place, she probably is the most valuable writer the South has in exposing to the world truths which it will be good for the South to know. Her philosophy of life is almost Platonic in its broadness. She is epigrammatic and possesses a universality that is startling in its masculinity.

There was a time when the South, like other parts of America, was reading the fascinating novels of Laura Jean Libby. Many a youthful swain and many a lovelorn maiden have succumbed to the influence of Libby love-scenes and paid tribute to the Young God in the most approved Libby manner. And then another pen began to make magic. It was Amelie P. Troubetzkoy's. That good lady, a Southerner of Southerners, out-Libbyed Miss Libby in her love technique. And what could be more romantic than scenes along bridle paths through Virginia valleys and down winding streams whose banks were littered with the red and gold of Autumn leaves! Many a young heart in the South has been made to beat double and triple time by the love scenes in Miss Troubetzkoy's novels. There was about them a flavor of sweetness that reminded one of magnolias and lilacs. What a far cry from Miss Troubetzkoy to James Branch Cabell!

With the Libby technique still hanging upon the Southern breezes, so to speak, Thomas Dixon appeared on the scene. But he mixed his romanticism with a little salt. He pictured a dreadful era in Southern history, when white supremacy was at stake, and so the hated carpet-bagger and his henchman, the traitorous Negro, were pictured in all their glory. His heroines retained their Libby-like features. They were gorgeous creatures, before whose feet strong men were wont to weep, particularly if the gorgeous creatures made the strong men think that they had no chance of winning their hands in marriage. In spite of these old-fashioned loyalties, Dixon contributed largely to the South's historical writing. He was the first writer to embellish the heinous work of the Ku Klux Klan with romance and beauty. And, considering the historical value of his books, it is not surprising that one of them became the basis for the well-known movie production, "The Birth of a Nation."

In their student days at the University of Virginia, Armistead C. Gordon and Thomas Nelson Page were close friends, and collaborated in the production of a volume of poems, entitled, "Befo' de War." The verses were done in Negro dialect. That was the beginning of the writing careers of these two men. Page, in his prime, was probably the foremost interpreter of the character of the Southern Negro, and when he died a few years ago after having made many notable contributions to American literature, he left the field to Gordon. The latter undoubtedly knows the habits and hopes and fears of the old-fashioned Southern Negro better than any other

writer in the South to-day. It is not amiss to state here that he is descended from the same Gordon ancestor from whom Lord Byron was descended. When he was a student with Page, he conceived the plot for "Marse Chan," one of Page's best known Negro stories. Whether the plot in Gordon's hands would have been a finer piece of work, the gods alone know, but it is safe to say that Page's story would be difficult to improve, what with its pathos and humor, and its ineffable charm. Gordon, in addition to his dialect and other types of stories concerning the South, has devoted a great deal of his time to historical and genealogical writing; and he is the first American to have written a biography of Lord Byron.

A writer who has attracted little attention outside the South, but who has pictured accurately certain types of the Southern girl and her problems, is Kate Langley Bosher. Mrs. Bosher's personal charm and her manner of writing remind one of Ellen Glasgow. She, too, is as conversant as any person writing in the South to-day, with the South's social problems and with the evolution of the South's customs and manners. Her novels are in a lighter vein than those of Miss Glasgow, and possess the real humor of the South; but because she chose to use insignificant vehicles, she has received little or no recognition from American critics.

Beatrice W. Ravenel, of South Carolina, is an altogether different type. Although by blood and marriage, a member of the foremost aristocratic class in her home State, she belongs to the modern school of writers, and has contributed some charming short stories and essays to

magazines concerning social life in Charleston and elsewhere. Unlike Miss Glasgow and Mrs. Boshier, Mrs. Ravenel received her education at one of the leading institutions of learning for young women in the North. So that in her writings she discloses an outlook and sometimes a technique, that reveals the influence of a Northern environment. There is probably no locality in the South more suggestive of the Old South to-day than the city of Charleston. Its old homes, its retention of old customs and its loyalty to old names and old traditions, makes it a golden place for material of the kind that Mrs. Ravenel uses.

One of Cabell's notable contemporaries in the South is Thomas S. Stribling of Tennessee. The *Virginian* and the *Tennessean* are of about the same age. Stribling's best known novels, "Birthright" and "Red Sand," however, are of the conventional type of the day, so that he cannot be classed with Cabell as a writer of the new romance. A better known native of Tennessee is Henry Sydnor Harrison, whose "Queed" and "V.V.'s Eyes" brought him fame a decade and a half ago. Harrison, a product of journalism, was a columnist for years on the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, where his talent first became known. Educated at a Northern University, he naturally obtained a broad outlook, and when his two novels, above mentioned, first appeared they were immediately popular. Both stories typified, as Harrison saw it, the customs and manners of the South as it was when they appeared. Queed, was a queer type of newspaper man, probably the queerest that has ever been pictured in a novel, so that he

was refreshingly different from the Southern fiction heroes that had preceded him. Around the career of Queed, Harrison, with a technique reminiscent of Dickens, assembled Southern types which made possible the distinctive charm that for so many years has belonged to that section of the country. He bordered upon realism, but never surrendered to it to the extent that he destroyed beauty. This writer removed to New York, where I understand he is now employed, in his forty-eighth year, as a cub reporter on the *New York World*. His friends were informed that he wanted to become a reporter so that he might get closer to his fellow men again, and because he felt that he had lost touch with the world by shutting himself up in a novelist's writing room. Like Ellen Glasgow, Harrison's later novels have followed the channels of realism, and this is notably true of his "Andrew Bride, of Paris."

One of the most popular writers in Southern journalism to-day is Robert Quillen, of South Carolina. Quillen won fame some years ago by contributing humorous and philosophical paragraphs to the newspapers. His homely wit and incisive philosophy attracted wide attention and to-day he contributes editorials and paragraphs to more than 150 newspapers throughout the country. He is a contributing editor on the staff of the *American Magazine*, and has two books to his credit, the best known of which is "One Man's Religion," in which he tears down, with Tennysonian simplicity, the futility of creeds and hidebound formalisms. Quillen is an odd character, and in 1925 startled his neighbors in Fountain Inn, S. C., by

erecting in his front yard a statue to Adam, the first man. His humor is so refreshing and so appropriate to modern social trends that one naturally is inclined to suspect that there is a trick somewhere. I discovered that it lies in the fact that Quillen is a native of Kansas, that dusty producer of odd characters like William Allen White and Ole Ed Howe. How could Quillen be anything else than something approaching a freak in Southern literature? But it must be confessed that he has given to the South, and to America as well, a balance and sanity that it long has needed.

Although since the outbreak of the World War in 1914, there has been a steadily increasing interest in poetry, and although some notable verse has been written by American poets, especially by the younger school of versifiers, the South has produced no verse writer of unusual distinction. With Edwin Arlington Robinson, a native of New England, as the criterion of modern American poetry, it would be difficult to find a poet anywhere in the Nation to compare with the Poes, Emersons and Whitmans of another age. Robinson's latest work, "Tristram" is said by critics to be the finest American achievement since the Victorian days of English poetry. If this is true, there has been no figure in the South since the Civil War to compare with him. It is true that since the close of the war, as is the case following all wars since writing verse became one of man's accomplishments, there has been a wealth of poetry paying tribute to the glory and valor of the Southland. Such a name as Father Ryan's, whose "Sword of Lee" stirred the Southern people,

comes to mind. But there has been no poet whose work would pass the severe scrutiny of the modern critic. This may be the critic's fault. I am not prepared to say.

However that may be, the outstanding poets, next to Robinson, in America, have not been Southerners, but Northerners, Easterners and Westerners. Such names come to mind as Vachel Lindsay, Robert Frost, Edgar Lee Masters, Anna Hempstead Branch, Amy Lowell, Louis Untermeyer, Brian Hooker, Robinson Jeffers, William Rose Benét, Sara Teasdale, Elinor Wylie, Carl Sandburg, Edna St. Vincent Millay, and the two famous poets who sacrificed their lives in the World War—Alan Seeger and Joyce Kilmer.

While such poets were making songs in the North, East and West, the South was producing Conrad Aiken, an exquisite singer, but a man whose poetry was as free of real plot and real thought as the *Doomsday Book*. Another Southern versifier was William Percy, of Mississippi, a lyricist of real distinction who hearkened back to the classics of his forefathers. The story of the prophet being without honor in his own country is applicable in eloquent fashion to Samuel Minturn Peck, a lyricist of Alabama. It is true that he is reminiscent of the Victorians, particularly of Tennyson, but no person who admires the Victorians will quarrel with that. Some of the most exquisite singing that has come from the South has been Peck's but, strange to say, the only recognition he has received has come to him from New England. He is now well past his three score and ten years; but is still writing distinctive verse, notably for such metro-

politan newspapers as the Boston *Transcript*. A scrutiny of Southern newspapers for many years, however, has failed to disclose one of his poems in their columns, and I wonder if his singing will turn to silence without having been heard by some discerning Southern editor.

Distinctive verse has come in recent years from the pen of Du Bose Heyward, of South Carolina. Heyward is another product of that charming environment, Charleston, and his "Carolina Chansons" are notably typical of the Old South done up in a modern dress. He has done much in his brief career—he is in his early forties, at this writing—to promote interest and taste in poetry. He founded the Poetry Society of South Carolina, one of the few organizations of its kind in the South, and has played an active part in the Poetry Society of America. His connections with these organizations inevitably have led him to the lecture platform where he has interpreted the trend of modern poetry with skill and scholarly insight.

One could not discuss Southern poetry without pointing to the work of the late Frank M. Stanton. This versifier, or to use a more appropriate term, this singer, was a columnist for more than thirty years on the Atlanta *Constitution*. He died in 1925. Stanton's best known poems, "Mighty Lak a Rose" and "Just Awearyin' For You," are representative of the white man's notion of what a Negro song ought to be. They bespeak the ideal of Negro song. The Negro would never as long as he lived, improvise a song quite comparable to "Mighty Lak a Rose," nevertheless, the sentiments expressed in that song have lived in the Negro heart. Stanton thus was the interpreter of

the highest love and sentiment in the Negro character. His insight into the hopes and fears of the Negro was Apollonian in its breadth and sympathy.

Another imported Southerner, not unlike Quillen in his whimsical humor, is Judd Mortimer Lewis who has been columnist and versifier for the Houston, Texas, *Post-Dispatch* for nearly thirty years. Lewis is a native of New York State, but his best singing has been of the South. His verse is of the homely type. In lyrics he has pictured the hopes and fears of the children of the South in a way that is reminiscent of Eugene Field.

The intelligentsia in the North are often prompted for some reason or other to belay the *Saturday Evening Post*, but that journal has done the nation a service by printing the stories of Octavus Roy Cohen, of Alabama, in which Cohen pictures, better than any other writer in the South has done, the character and manners of the modern Southern Negro, that is, the young Negro of the present generation. The antics of his Florian Slappy, taken from the Negro colony of Birmingham, are realistic studies of the present-day Negro mind and outlook in the South. There is as much difference between Florian Slappy and Uncle Remus as there is between Colonel Billy Mitchell, of aviation fame, and General George Washington. Changed social conditions among the Negroes in the South have been pictured by Cohen with photographic accuracy, and while some of his characters and scenes are exaggerated, they undoubtedly give the reader a correct view of the new Southern Negro, whose economic independence rapidly is increasing and whose business sagacity

and prowess consequently are developing. At the same time the Negro's new status has not changed some of those characteristics which have made his race distinctive, characteristics that appeal to the humor of the white man. Such a man as Florian Slappy is far more humorous in his metropolitan sophistication than Uncle Remus was in his rural wisdom. The tar baby has departed. His figure is lost beyond the horizon of the past. In his stead, thanks to Cohen, there has come out of the South a new and refreshing type and one that unquestionably may have something to say about how the South's future is going to be shaped.

Cohen's picture of the New Southern Negro probably would never have been painted but for the wisdom of George Horace Lorimer, editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*. The story is told that Lorimer, year after year, rejected manuscripts from Cohen's pen concerning the activities of baseball stars. It appears that he knew little or nothing about sports, but he persisted. Finally, after many rejections, he got on a train, speeded North, and faced the editor in his lair. Lorimer promptly told him that when he wrote about sports he picked a subject about which he knew nothing. This stunned Cohen, but Lorimer made amends. Why didn't Cohen write about the new Negro in Birmingham, a subject with which he was wholly familiar? Yes, why not? thought Cohen, and he hotfooted it back to Birmingham and composed his first Florian Slappy story. It was accepted immediately.

One of the last remaining figures of the old classical South is Edward V. Valentine, sculptor, of Richmond,

Virginia. Mr. Valentine would not appropriately belong in a chapter concerning the literature of the South if it were not for the fact that he has been writing a diary consistently since the year 1857. And any man who can write a diary for more than seventy years deserves to be reckoned as a writer of note, as well as a sculptor. The only difficulty is that Mr. Valentine has never published his diary. Newspapers in his State and book publishers have urged him to publish portions of it, at least, but he has refused steadfastly, holding that he intends to use the material for his memoirs. When it is remembered that this man represents the best of the old-time classical scholarship in the South and that during his long life—he is in his ninetieth year at this writing—he has met with some of the foremost notables of history, one is struck with the potentialities of his long diary.

Valentine's best known sculptures are his recumbent statue of Robert E. Lee in the Lee chapel at Lexington, Virginia; his bronze figure of "Stonewall Jackson" in the same town; and his heroic bronze statues of Jefferson Davis and allegorical female figures, symbolical of the South, in Richmond. He studied sculpturing in France, Italy and Germany and was a pupil under some of Europe's best known sculptors, among them being Jouffroy in Paris, Bonaiuti in Florence and Kiss in Berlin. His diary, properly edited and arranged, is destined some day to be a notable contribution to Southern literature, particularly that part which must deal with the days when General Lee was posing for his famous recumbent statue in Lexington. And if the diary reflects the opinions on

modern trends in art which Valentine has voiced to close friends, it will give an interesting glimpse of the mental reactions to changing times of a man who has lived through the most interesting period of the South's history. It is not amiss to say that Valentine's deepest concern is what he conceives to be the South's failure to maintain its old-time standards of scholarship and its traditional love for the classics. In his estimation the modern so-called educated man is a moron compared with the educated man of his young days, of the days when Dickens and Thackeray toured America and when Poe's name was still fresh on the lips of poetry lovers.

Among the South's leading intellectuals of the present generation is John Powell, the pianist and composer. Powell obtained a B.A. degree at the University of Virginia and then studied music in this country and in Vienna. He made his debut as a pianist in Berlin in 1907 and began composing in 1909. He is an ardent lover of the South as his compositions disclose, notable among them being his piano suite, "In the South" and his overture, "In Old Virginia." One of Powell's chief concerns in respect to the South's future is the encroachment, as he sees it, of Negroid blood upon the whites. After the World War, this idea persisted in his mind, so he joined the new Ku Klux Klan organization, believing that as a member of that order he could aid in stemming the Negroid movement.

In a few months he was disgusted with the operations of the Klan and gave up his membership. Then he founded what is known as the Anglo-Saxon Club. He

has written some interesting papers on the subject of the Negro and his future, and lectured in many places in the South on the purposes of the Anglo-Saxon Club, notably at the University of Virginia. It was due to Powell's energy that the General Assembly of Virginia, a few years ago, seriously considered, but fortunately did not pass, a proposed measure establishing persons having Indian blood in their veins as being in the same class with Negroes. To understand what this would have meant, one must remember that some of the best families in the Old Dominion are descended from the Indian Princess, Pocahontas, including the Bolling family of whom the second Mrs. Woodrow Wilson is a member. Powell and his associates stirred up a hornets' nest when they proposed such a law, and echoes from the excitement are still being heard in Virginia. He is a writer of distinction, as well as a composer of international fame.

The day is not far off, I believe, when there will be no distinctive Southern literature. Indeed, that day is upon the South now. The section's political and religious solidarity is not preventing its writers from becoming one with the writers of other sections in their technique and philosophies. Books and stories will be written about the South as a section for many years to come, but they will be written with an American rather than a Southern point of view. This is inevitable in the very nature of things. The South is saturated with the literatures of the world; and literary values no longer are being predicated upon sentiment and tradition, but upon the basis of modern

appraisement. The South gradually is surrendering, in its literary accomplishments, and in its literary tastes, to the great Literary Battalion of Death, composed of those critics who are bent upon destroying the old gods.

CHAPTER XVI

NEO-KU-KLUX

The art of lynching is one that was created and developed in the South in so far as the term is concerned, although the practice of flogging, hanging and burning at the stake, was known to man centuries before America was discovered by white explorers. The result is that the South, more or less, since the day of the illustrious Judge Charles Lynch, of Virginia, has borne unjustly the reputation of being the only section in the country where lynchings are indulged in by angry mobs, in spite of records which show that such crimes have been committed in large and small degree in practically every other State in the Union.

Judge Lynch, who lived between the years 1736 and 1796, was a justice of the peace in Bedford county, Virginia. During the last year of the Revolution, when the anti-British feeling was strong, he found pleasure in hanging Tories and Loyalists without the benefit of trial by judge or jury. The application of the term lynching to the practice of murdering people without a fair hearing, was a natural consequence, and it has stuck to this day.

Judge Lynch's lawlessness was isolated, so it remained for the Ku Klux Klansmen of Reconstruction days to put into practice the Lynch technique on a large scale. The Klansman of Reconstruction days was prompted by but

one aim, namely, to maintain white supremacy against the efforts of "carpet-baggers" and their Negro allies to make the blacks dominant politically, and if possible socially, in the South. The activities of the Reconstruction Klansmen brought a stain to the South which that section unfortunately has never been quite able to remove. Where Judge Lynch had hanged a small number of Tories and Loyalists, the Klansmen of 1866 and 1871, inclusive, wrote a bloody chapter in the history of the South, which included floggings, tortures and killings in every State in the South on a wholesale scale. But by the year 1875 the activities of the Klansmen had ceased altogether. But this fact should be marked: Lynchings did not cease. There were lynchings year after year in the South—and in the North, too—at the hands of mobs of so-called citizens, who were not affiliated with any secret order, certainly not with the Klan. Reviewing the record of lynchings from the year 1885 down to the year 1915, it is interesting to note that the practice of lynching was indulged in quite freely, and that whites as well as blacks were put to death, although the number of Negroes lynched each year was larger. I use the year 1915 as the end of this record because it was then that the new Ku Klux Klan, the organization as we know it to-day, was founded at Atlanta, Georgia, by Col. William J. Simmons.

In the period between 1885 and 1915, there was a much larger number of lynchings than for the period between 1915 and 1925, the decade in which the new organization of Klansmen has flourished. In the ten-year period, from 1885 to 1895, there were 1,897 lynchings, nearly

half of whom were whites. In the decade from 1907 to 1917, there were 724 lynchings. And from 1918 to the year 1925, there were but 395. It can be seen from these figures that during the entire period, from 1885 to 1925, the greatest number of lynchings occurred before the new order of the Ku Klux Klan was organized. These figures are noteworthy because they disclose that the new Klan as such is not particularly identified with homicides, and that on the contrary lynchings are crimes that arise out of social conditions with which the new Klan has had little or nothing to do.

The Chicago *Tribune* some years ago printed statistics covering the years 1882 to 1903 inclusive which showed that during the twenty-year period 3,337 persons were lynched. Of this number 2,385 were in the South and 752 in the North. The newspaper disclosed that the lynchings in the South were for murder or rape and that those in the North were for murder or offenses against property. This reveals the wide difference in the social condition of the two sections,—the South with its huge Negro population and the North with its small Negro population. In the South more Negroes, by far, than white persons were lynched, while the reverse prevailed in the North.

The new order of the Ku Klux Klan, it would appear from these figures, certainly has not increased the number of homicides, even if it has, as some critics contend, been responsible for the depredations which have occurred in the South since its organization in 1915.

In October, 1915, the World War had been raging for

a year. American newspapers for more than twelve months had been regaling their readers with accounts of war activities. The German armies had invaded the brave little country, Belgium, and stories, from time to time, had appeared in American newspapers, in spite of our supposed attitude of neutrality, recounting German atrocities. In this country, patriotic Americans turned their thoughts to past feverish eras in our own history. In young men's minds in the South, the days of the Civil War returned; battles whose glories had been handed down were refought, in mind and spirit. Inevitably, the days of the Reconstruction Klansmen caught the fancy of a certain young man in the South. Fired by war talk from across the seas, and visualizing our own entry into the fray, at some later time, the idea of "100 per cent. Americanism" seized him. Nativism caught his fancy. Perhaps, the German represented the arch-opponent to American nativism as he envisioned it, but all foreigners, more or less, must be foes. Moreover, the South was a Protestant domain, so necessarily, as had been in the times of his forefathers, the Catholics were foes. Reconstruction days when the old time Klansmen had ridden down the lanes in hood and gown to frighten Negroes from their cabins, established opposition to the Negro. The thing to do, then, the young man thought, was to reorganize the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in all their glory. The young man's name was William J. Simmons.

On October 16, 1915, Simmons, with thirty-four associates, three of whom had been members of the old Klan, gathered on top of Stone Mountain, near Atlanta, the

mountain of rock upon which now is being carved a gigantic monument to the Confederate Army. They had obtained a charter from the State of Georgia. Atop the mountain they took an oath of allegiance to the "Invisible Empire, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan." In many ways, Simmons, at this time, was not unlike Don Quixote, who imagined a flock of sheep to be an army of opponents which he must vanquish. Simmons and his associates were determined to vanquish foes who under our organic and statutory laws, are entitled to live, own property and pursue happiness in the same measure that Simmons and his associates enjoy those rights. But, that was neither here nor there. Somebody had to be vanquished. The Germans had invaded Belgium and cut off the legs and arms of infants, so the thing for Simmons and his friends to do was to wear white masks and long white gowns and put an end to the invasions and encroachments of Catholics, Jews, Negroes, pacifists and Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks had not shown their faces in 1915, but they were in the making and Simmons and his friends recognized them when they saw them.

The mental attitude of Simmons, *et al*, was not a new thing. The members of the old Know Nothing party had indulged in the same kind of puerility. The Know Nothing party's fetish was 100 per cent. Americanism, although it had not gone by that name. At first the Know Nothings called themselves "The Sons of '76" or the "Order of the Star-Spangled Banner," and formed for the purpose of keeping out the hated foreigners. Their slogan was "Americans must rule America," the same

principle which the new Klan adopted. Its chief concern was the Catholic church, and it hoped by cutting down the immigration of those races which belonged to the Catholic church it could keep America pure and undefiled. The Know Nothings were organized about the year 1850; but their nativism had run back to colonial days. From 1830 to 1850 there had been a marked nativism because of the increased Irish immigration. And these Irish were members of the Catholic church.

The Know Nothings would never answer questions. Their stock answer to queries was, "I don't know." The same idea of secrecy was taken up by the new Klan. In spite of the Federal Constitution, in spite of the protective statutory and unwritten laws of the land, the Know Nothings, in time, were able to draw many adherents to their banners, because they broadcast their nativism with a certain amount of plausibility. In 1854 they showed considerable strength in the election. They surprised their opponents by carrying the State of Massachusetts and nearly succeeded in electing their candidates in New York. A parallel came later when the Ku Klux Klan, between 1919 and 1924, inclusive, entered State and National politics with surprising success. It was successful in local and Senatorial races in Texas and Oregon; and reached a place of power in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois by the year 1923; but as it grew in power north of the Mason and Dixon line, it apparently decreased in strength in the South, and in the year 1926 and 1927 was repudiated by the electorate in its home State, Georgia.

After having gathered "under a blazing, fiery torch" on

top of Stone Mountain on that memorable October night, 1915, Col. Simmons and his associates turned their attention to forming a Nation-wide organization, with their first campaign in the South. The newspapers were being filled with accounts of the World War. The election of 1916 had hinged upon Mr. Wilson's policy of neutrality. Thousands of people voted for him on the strength of the slogan, "He kept us out of the war!" During the Winter of 1916-1917, the famous exchange of notes with Germany was taking place; and America's entry into the conflict was inevitable. Simmons and his associates were working persistently, but were unable to make a strong appeal at a time when men's thoughts were turning to the battle fronts of France.

Finally we entered the war, and all American activities, Klan or otherwise, were submerged in the prosecution of the war. The conflict made brothers of Protestant and Jew, of Protestant and Catholic, of white man and Negro. The war drove from the minds of the 100 percenters the idea that alien-born Americans should be driven into the sea like the Gadarine swine. Work had to be done across the seas,—and it had to be done with men of all creeds and bloods coördinating their minds and talents and fighting abilities. So the year 1917 passed without incident in so far as the Klan was concerned. As a matter of fact, Simmons and his associates had to suspend their activities. They and their relatives and friends were too busy working and fighting shoulder to shoulder with the very men and women whom they had vowed on top of Stone Moun-

tain to check and throttle and if possible drive from the domain. The campaign had to wait.

The year 1918 passed uneventfully in so far as the Klan was concerned. This was a glorious year for the American army on the Western front. Catholics, Jews, men who originally had been pacifists and Negroes were coördinating their talents and courage to defeat the Huns. The doctrine of nativism was as dead as a dodo during this eventful year. All the creeds and races of the earth were fighting for the Wilsonian conception of democracy. They had no time for quarrels and contentions about forms of worship and religious beliefs. They had no time for considering the color of skins,—whether they were white, yellow, brown or black. They had a big work to do,—and they were doing it well.

In November, 1918, the war officially ended. A month later plans were being made for the demobilization of the Protestants, Catholics, Jews and foreigners. The Spring of 1919 saw the last detachments of American troops on American soil, save those which had been sent to the Rhine to join the Allied armies of occupation.

The glory of conflict, however, was still in the minds of men. Many Americans were disappointed that the Germans had not been driven to Berlin and there cooped up and flogged or burned at the stake. Their atrocities in Belgium justified it. War talk was prevalent. The fighting spirit was still high. Glory had come to few. Glory had not come to many, because luck was against them. But glory was to be had if one but looked for it.

Col. Simmons and his friends saw their chance, so they

took up their work in the Spring of 1919 where they had left off in 1916 and in the early part of 1917. In May, 1919, American newspapers carried the account of the burning of five Negro churches in a small community in Georgia. The work was attributed to the Klan; and from that time until the present most of the depredations, including murders and destruction of property in the South, have been laid at Klan doors.

The burning of the churches was the only act,—whether it was done by the Klan or not,—that attracted nation-wide attention. No other activity of the Klan is recorded for the year 1919. In 1920, however, the Klan began to show its colors. In Jacksonville, Florida, 500 members of the new organization had its first parade in the South. The appearance of the Klansmen in all their regalia was a warning to Negroes who it was claimed had been disorderly at the polls. In the same year the Klan took a hand in a vice crusade in Anniston, Alabama. And another parade was held in Columbus, Georgia. These events were about all that marked the activities of the order during 1920.

In 1920, however, within the organization, an important event occurred, although it did not receive wide public notice. Col. Simmons, who now was the Imperial Wizard, and his associates, had by this time obtained a membership of about 5,000. Simmons was not a business man. He confined his activities to spellbinding the native white Protestants of the South with the nightmare of a nation overridden with Catholics, Jews and Negroes. But his eloquence alone could not be depended

upon to make the order spread and grow as the founders desired.

So it was that Edward Y. Clarke and Mrs. Elizabeth Tyler were hired to take charge of the financial management of the Klan and to direct its propaganda department. Clarke and Mrs. Tyler were highly trained operators. They had been connected with the Southern Publicity Association and had directed successful drives for the Anti-Saloon League, the Roosevelt Memorial Fund and the Near East Relief work. Under their able management the Klan grew to a membership in 1925 estimated at 100,000, with members in many States in and out of the South.

With the alert Mr. Clarke and the keen-witted Mrs. Tyler, in charge, the Klan grew and thrived to such an extent that it soon attracted nation-wide attention. Newspapers in the North were beginning to speak of it as a "menace" and "un-American"; and public officials were denouncing it at banquets and political gatherings. Catholic prelates and Jewish rabbis were belaying it. The ball was started rolling in 1921 when Mayor Hylan, of New York, in a letter to Police Commissioner Enright, issued a warning against the operations of the Klan. There was no room in his great city, he said, for an organization that promoted race antagonism. Col. Simmons immediately issued an announcement in which he offered a reward for the conviction of any one who used the Klan's name unlawfully.

Clarke and Mrs. Tyler, by the year 1921, were reaping large financial returns for the organization. The mem-

bership fee was \$10. Four dollars went to the Kleagle or local solicitor when he signed up a new member. One dollar went into the pocket of the King Kleagle who ruled over the State; fifty cents went to the Goblin who had charge of a district; and \$4.50 went to headquarters at Atlanta. How much of this \$4.50 went to Clarke and Mrs. Tyler, I do not know, but former Klansmen have accused them of getting a large portion of it.

The first act of atrocity, attributed to the new Klan, occurred in January, 1921, when a Negro, named A. Johnson, in Dallas, Texas, was branded on the forehead with the letters, "K K K." His attackers used acid. In April, at a meeting of the Richmond Chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, a resolution was adopted calling on State officials to bar the Klan from the Old Dominion. In May a huge celebration of the Klan was staged in Atlanta; and in the same month 2,000 members held a ceremony in Cincinnati. Know Nothingism was being revived with a vengeance. And it knew no geographical bounds, thanks to the able work of Mr. Clarke and Mrs. Tyler. The order had spread so far by September that the district attorney of Boston called on the citizens of his town to coöperate with him in opposing it. Police officials were instructed to investigate it in Connecticut. Detroit prohibited the showing of a Klan film in the city. The Chicago city council barred the Klan from the Illinois city. The Federal Government took cognizance of the existence of the Klan and Department of Justice agents made an investigation which resulted in a Congressional inquiry into its operations. The Mayor

of Louisville, Kentucky, denounced the order and forbade its meetings. The prosecuting attorney of Michigan denounced it and warned the students of the university in that State not to join it. The Governor of Missouri condemned it. The Director of Public Safety in New Jersey denounced it. The Cleveland, Ohio, city council opposed it. The Governor of Wisconsin condemned it. A wave of opposition to the Klan and all its works was spreading throughout the nation.

The New York *World*, one of the country's leading journalistic crusaders, launched a campaign against the Klan, and sent out staff men to gather up evidence against it. Their inquiries showed that from October, 1920, to October, 1921, the Klan was guilty of four killings, one mutilation, one branding with acid, forty-one floggings, twenty-seven tar and feather parties, five kidnappings, forty-three persons threatened or made to leave town, fourteen communities threatened by warning posters, and sixteen parades of masked men with warning placards.

It will be noted that the New York *World's* figures show four killings attributed to the Klan during the twelve months' period. The record for lynchings during that year was 64, of whom 5 were white men. It is hardly necessary to say that this compares favorably with the 100 lynchings in 1908, 107 in 1901, 122 in 1897, 200 in 1893 and 255 in 1892, years in which the Ku Klux Klan did not exist. It might be said, then, that in spite of the *World's* disclosures, the Klan, as a menace to America so far as homicides were concerned, was a small matter com-

pared with the lawlessness of mobs that had no fraternal identity.

Early in September, 1921, the New York *World* brought charges of disorderly conduct against Clarke and Mrs. Tyler, and an unsuccessful effort was made to indict them. At the same time dissension broke out in the Klan's own ranks, and in December of the same year four grand goblins of the Atlanta branch of the order demanded the removal of Clarke, who now was known as the Imperial Kleagle. Simmons, however, removed the goblins and to show his confidence in Clarke placed him in supreme command for several weeks.

Opposition to the order continued. The United Mine Workers of America passed resolutions barring their workers from Klan membership. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, in a Jewish New Year's sermon, denounced it. And about this time a Congressional investigation of the order got under way, in which some interesting testimony was obtained from the Imperial Wizard, Col. Simmons. The Imperial Wizard denied his order was a lawless organization and insisted that it was not patterned after the Klan of Reconstruction days. Briefly, he held that Ku Kluxism, as now constituted, stands for 100 per cent. Americanism, meaning, from his standpoint, an Americanism that incorporates white supremacy, Protestantism, nativism and Christianity, so called.

In December, 1921, there were wholesale resignations in the Klan's official ranks; dissension became rife, and 170 deposed Klansmen filed a petition in Atlanta for a receivership for the order. About this time the National

Unity Council was organized in Chicago to fight the order on a national scale. Its activities, however, were confined to broadcasting anti-Klan literature and investigating outrages attributed to the hooded band.

During the year 1922 the Klan's influence and strength were mercurial. There was, however, no evidence of violence on the order's part, to any serious degree, save at Mer Rouge, Louisiana, where several killings were staged. The Mer Rouge incident attracted nation-wide attention and resulted in the conviction of about thirty members of the local Klan. In 1922, Mrs. Tyler, following an attempt on her life and repeated attacks against her character, resigned. In an annual convention in Cincinnati, the American Federation of Labor opposed parades of masked bodies, obviously aiming at the Klan. The flogging of a Negro occurred in Arizona, and a constable was killed in California. Both outrages were attributed to the Klan.

The order, this year, showed noticeable political influence in Florida and Georgia, and in New York and, notably, in Connecticut. President Harding, in a personal letter to a Mrs. F. L. Applegate, expressed disapproval of the order. The lady had hardly received his letter before word was broadcast in the newspapers that a prominent doctor had been flogged by a masked band in Illinois. About this time the Rev. R. W. Mark, pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Elizabeth, N. J., announced in his pulpit that he would prefer the Klan any day to the Knights of Columbus. In Arkansas the Klan endorsed a candidate for Governor. In Texas it was a factor in the State primary.

In 1923, ridicule by the press and denunciations from pulpits and platforms had driven the Klan into more or less inactivity. Then, too, there was a reorganization. Hiram Wesley Evans, a dentist, succeeded Col. Simmons as Imperial Wizard in December, 1922, and the organization at once grew more conservative under his administration. Evans, a native of Alabama, had received his education at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, where conservatism reigns more or less in so far as Protestantism is concerned. It is noteworthy that Evans is a member of the church of the Disciples of Christ, a denomination which, while it has subscribed to the orthodox doctrines of the evangelical churches, has stressed the ideal of Christian unity. One could hardly be an ardent member of such a church and practice the outrageous intolerance which was the purpose of Simmons and his associates in the beginning.

So, while the Klan grew tamer in its activities, it grew stronger in membership, in spite of the attacks on it by the press, pulpit and platform, and by the year 1926 it is estimated that it had 2,500,000 enrolled members. To-day the Klan is not looked upon seriously as a menace, and its opponents are more given to ridiculing it and laughing at its antics than to becoming disturbed over its existence. It is interesting to note that in the Spring of 1927 the *New York World*, one of the order's staunchest opponents, rebuked the authorities of a New York borough for refusing to let the Klan take part in a parade with other fraternal organizations. The *World* probably had come to realize that a mountain had been made out of a mole-

hill in so far as the likelihood of the Klan's ever destroying real American institutions was concerned.

In the South the Klan is not taken seriously to-day. The leading newspapers there have opposed it vigorously, including such dailies as the *Atlanta Constitution*, the *Memphis Commercial-Appeal*, the Richmond dailies, the *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot*, the dailies in Columbia and Charleston, South Carolina, the larger dailies in North Carolina and the *News* in Birmingham, Alabama. In practically every Southern State are to be found one or more newspapers which have fought and are still fighting the Klan, when opposition to it is found necessary.

Occasionally disorders occur. Now and then there are kidnappings and floggings, which invariably are attributed to the Klan; but when the activities of the Klan are compared with the lawless acts of lynching mobs, the Klan is far from being the menace that it has been pictured. I believe that as time goes on and as the South receives into its community life more of the real American outlook, and as the South comes more and more to see that the protective ægis of the Federal Constitution is designed for no special group of Americans, it will think less and less of the Klan.

To-day the membership of the order is confined more or less to the ignorant classes of white men in the South. Protestantism has played a strong hand in promoting its interests, and this is particularly true of the Methodists; but the Protestants cannot be blamed for its depredations. It is the life of Protestantism, in its most ignorant form, to condemn and oppose the Catholic and the Jew, so that

it was but a natural consequence for it to be in sympathy with the new Klan. Moreover, the Klan of to-day professes to stand for law enforcement, which means that it stands, outwardly at least, for the prohibition laws. At the same time it can safely be said that there are as many users of liquor in the Klan ranks as there are out of it. In any event, the tenets of the Klan are so closely allied with those of the fundamentalists in the Protestant ranks, that one should not be surprised to see Methodist, and sometimes Baptist, brethren of the cloth allying themselves with pillow cover, nightgown and fiery cross.

Ku Kluxism is, as its critics have maintained, un-American in nearly all its aims and purposes, when Americanism is considered in the light of a citizen's equal rights under the Constitution, regardless of race, religion or color. But the same thing might be said of certain kinds of Protestantism which exist in America to-day, particularly in the South.

In 1915, Col. Simmons started a movement which undoubtedly has had a remarkable growth; but, I believe that in time his work will have turned out to be a service to America, because it has done more than probably any other movement, since the days of the Know Nothings, to reveal the ugliness of Protestantism and nativism as they have been practiced in the South. For many years religious and political bigotry were confined more or less to the South; but thanks to Simmons and his able henchman and henchwoman, Clarke and Mrs. Tyler, he was able to lay this bigotry right at the feet of the people of other

sections of the country where they were able to see at first hand. The result was inevitable.

The Klan now has a large membership; but it has little or no influence at this writing. And I believe that in a few years it will be so ridiculed and discredited that it will exert no more power in Southern or American society than Chinatown or the Black Hand.

CHAPTER XVII

THE TARIFF

Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock's observation on the tariff problem, when he was Democratic candidate against James A. Garfield in 1880, applies to the Solid South to-day as forcibly as it would have applied to the colonies had he uttered it when Congress was in session in 1789-1791 and passed our first tariff laws. General Hancock was credited by the Republicans with having said, "The tariff is a local issue"; but what he really said was that "the tariff question is a local question," meaning that different sections of the country had an unequal interest in the enactment of the tariff laws. The garbled statement, however, was broadcast by his political opponents in an effort to show that General Hancock knew as much about tariffs as Thomas Jefferson knew about the modern airplane; and Garfield's victory may be attributed in part to this notion among the electorate.

But in so far as the South was and is concerned the General was correct. Among the most humorous passages in our Congressional records are those pertaining to the debates on the tariff in the session of 1789-1791. It was the beginning of what now has become a familiar story,—the cry of the manufacturing States for protection. At that time, as now, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut were the manufacturing

States which were insistent upon protecting their "infant industries." But sectionalism then had not become so alive, so the tariff debate was drawn down purely to a matter of economic, rather than political, interest.

Had a Ring Lardner or an Irvin Cobb reported the proceedings in Congress in 1789-1791 concerning the tariff, we doubtless would have had one of their most laughable sketches. For example, the representative from Pennsylvania proposed protection for the steel industry which had but recently been established in that State, but the representative of South Carolina protested that "the smallest tax on steel would be a burden on agriculture." The Pennsylvania representative also advocated a duty on beer, declaring that the brewing interests, both in Philadelphia and New York, "were highly deserving of encouragement." Malt liquors, he argued, were less intoxicating than rum, and as an element of diet were far preferable. The growers of hops and barley did not object, but some of the Southern States that exchanged some of their goods for outside beer vigorously objected. The chandlers of Philadelphia and of Roxbury, Mass., had brought the manufacture of wax, spermaceti, and tallow candles to such a degree of perfection that they expected in a few years to provide for the needs of the Western Hemisphere, so they sought protection against wholesale importations from Russia and Ireland. It was argued that candles might eventually be made in America "cheaper than could be imported if a small encouragement was held out to them since raw materials were to be had in abundance." But the representative from

South Carolina again protested. He declared the protection would work a hardship on the users of candles.

Connecticut asked that ships' anchors be protected. These were being made at Litchfield. And Massachusetts asked for a protective duty on nails. Her representative naïvely declared that, "In winter, and on evenings when little other work is done, great quantities of nails are made by the children; perhaps enough might be manufactured in this way to supply the continent, since the business could be prosecuted in a similar manner in every State exerting equal industry." The Southerners, however, protested that such duties would work hardships on the men who were building houses and ships.

The leather industry, then as now, was centered in Massachusetts, and it had been developed also in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey and Maryland, so protection was asked by these States on leather. In the South, however, where hides were tanned for exportation and only the coarsest shoes were made for plantation laborers, such duties were felt to be a burden.

Looking back from this distance, it is amusing to recall that when Virginia asked for a protective duty of two cents a bushel on coal, as the result of opening mines near Richmond, the manufacturers of Pennsylvania protested that the duty would be a tax on fuel! When the protest was made coal had not been discovered in Pennsylvania, and since that memorable session the Pennsylvanians have eaten their words in more ways than one!

I have reviewed enough of the Congressional session of 1789-1791 to show that General Hancock was alto-

gether correct in his conclusions, and that primarily the tariff question in this country was, as it is between the North and South to-day, a conflict of interest between producer and consumer. Consider for a moment Louisiana's attitude toward the sugar tariff. But during and following the Civil War the tariff question became almost as big an issue as the question of slavery; and to-day the Southern States, as a whole, while adhering to the free trade or revenue tariff, as opposed to protection, for sentimental and political reasons, are beginning to change their views for economic reasons.

Sentimentally the South is opposed to the protective tariff because it is an outgrowth of the operations of the radical measures of the Republican Reconstruction Congress, and the political opposition of the South to protection constitutes one of the main differences between the Republicans and Democrats to-day. South Carolina still recalls with pride how she nullified the tariff act of 1832 and thereby nearly precipitated a civil war, and this episode, coupled with the fact that South Carolina looks upon anything connected with the Republican party as evil, probably would prevent that State from advocating protection even if such a policy favored the commonwealth economically.

At this juncture it is not amiss to analyze briefly just what tariff protection as favored by the Republican party means, and as opposed by the Democrats signifies. Protection, as sponsored by the Republican party, so arranges the rates of duty on importation as to make their cost to the consumer equal to or greater than the cost of similar

domestic products; and the advocates of protection argue that protection compels foreigners to pay a part of our taxes; that without it we would have to give up manufacturing and take up agriculture; that the absence of protection would mean that the labor of this country would have to compete with cheap labor abroad; that investments at home are encouraged by protection; and that competition between home manufacturers will keep down prices.

Against this argument the Democratic party, adhering generally to the principle of a tariff for revenue only, holds, in effect, that first a nation should devote itself to industries which are natural to it; that if other nations can produce articles cheaper than we can, it is unnecessary national extravagance to waste strength that could more profitably be devoted to other pursuits; and that, above all, protection benefits only a minority of the nation at the expense of the large majority. Added to this is the insistence by the Democrats, since the World War, that the protective tariff retards the payment by other nations of their war debts to this country.

It cannot be denied that the Democrats have a good deal of soundness as well as justice on their side, from a purely political standpoint; and I use the term political here in its highest sense. But the Democratic party is made up of human beings, and human beings now, as always, are guided more or less by their individual wants. So, when the Southern Democrats learn, to a convincing extent, the truthfulness of General Hancock's famous philosophy, one of the old political barriers between the North and South will have crumbled away.

Meanwhile, the Democrats have but one period in our history to which they can point as an example of the soundness of their doctrine. Protection, to use an historian's phrase, has since the year 1882 been "triumphant." And the only time when we really had a tariff for revenue only, or what amounted almost to free trade, was when the famous bill of R. J. Walker was passed in 1846. Walker was Secretary of the Treasury throughout Polk's administration. He financed the war with Mexico, and drafted the bill in 1849 for the establishment of the Department of the Interior. In 1845 he prepared a treasury report in which he attacked the protective theory which is considered by some as comparable in genius and insight to Hamilton's famous "Report on Manufactures," favoring protection. The "Walker Tariff" of 1846 was based on this report. It was the nearest approach to a free trade policy that the United States has ever had. Its aims were simply to meet the expenses of government, and so eliminate entirely the principle of protection. It was successful as a revenue measure and remained in force for fifteen years, or until 1861. In a report, issued in December, 1846, which to-day would be considered amazing by the more vigorous advocates of protection, Secretary Walker said:

"We are beginning to realize the benefits of the new tariff. . . . By free interchange of commodities the foreign market is opened to our agricultural products, our tonnage and commerce are rapidly augmenting, our exports enlarged and the price enhanced; exchanges are in our favor, and specie is flowing within our limits. The

country was never more prosperous and we have never enjoyed such large and profitable markets for all our products. . . . New manufactories are being erected throughout the country, and still yield a greater profit in most cases than capital invested in other pursuits."

There have been times since the Civil War when Democratic stump orators referred to the Walker tariff as upholding their doctrine; but Walker's name is no longer heard; and the Democrats have never had a chance, since the Civil War, to approach anything resembling the Walker tariff. The Walker tariff provided for an average rate of $25\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the nearest thing to it was the Democratic Wilson bill, passed in 1894, which provided for an average duty of 37 per cent. To-day protection provides for average duties of 50 per cent., and this figure probably will be exceeded if the Republicans maintain their power in Washington.

Until the outbreak of the Civil War the tariff question was predicated solely on local interests much after the way in which these interests were disclosed in the Congressional session of 1789-1791, although the principle of a tariff for revenue only and a policy verging upon free trade had been adopted more or less by the Democratic party. In the national convention of the party in 1856 Buchanan was nominated on a platform demanding free trade; and in 1857 a bill was passed enlarging the free trade list on the Walker tariff and lowering the average duty to about 20 per cent. In 1856 and 1857, however, it should be remembered that the Democratic party was

not an organization confined to the South alone. It was just as potent in the North.

But after the outbreak of the war the Republican party was forced to adopt drastic measures to enable the administration to prosecute the war, and one of the first things done was the passage of the Morrill Act raising the tariff of 1857 one-third. The tariff again was increased in 1862, and in 1864 a joint resolution in Congress raised the tariff 50 per cent. for a period of sixty days, and this later was extended to ninety days. In 1865 and 1866 the expenses of the war made greater demands and further increases were made. The Government gradually was moving into a policy of protection from which it later learned that it was well-nigh impossible to quit. In 1867 the Wool Growers' Association met at Syracuse, New York, and formed an alliance and asked for and obtained an increase in the tariff on wool. Since then the wool growers have never wanted for tariff protection, and its bulletins and data on tariff problems are used as guides to-day by Republican statesmen whose responsibility it is to make up the administration's tariff schedules. Between 1867 and 1882 little or no tariff action of any consequence was taken by the Republicans; but in 1882 the protective movement became stronger, and that year marked the beginning of what was to become the present tariff policy of the Republican party, allying the party irrevocably with the so-called business or manufacturing interests of the country. The strange thing about the movement was that it was not followed as a piece of political strategy, but grew out of

war necessity and became a Republican fetish because of that fact.

Inasmuch as protection was an outgrowth of the Republican party's prosecution of the Civil War, it naturally became anathema to the Southerners. They no longer considered the tariff as solely an economic problem. They no longer viewed it in accordance with local self-interests as had been the case in 1789 and 1791. Protection became a hated thing because it was what they considered to be the bastard child of the Reconstruction Congress,—and a bastard child it remained to the South until within the last five years or more.

While the Southerners are reluctant to drive out of their hearts the traditional hate for a thing which had been devised by the monstrous Reconstruction Congress, economic conditions, nevertheless, have been forcing and are continuing to force them to change their minds about the tariff in different ways, according to local interests. Some sections of the country where a protective tariff would be as beneficial as it appears to be to New England manufacturers, have fought against the theory as valiantly and vainly as the Russian communists in recent times have fought against the inevitability of capitalism.

To-day the Solid South slowly but surely is moving into a position where it is ready to surrender one of its old war hatreds. Brave and full of fortitude, and for years romantically prepared to starve rather than give an inch more to Yankee principles than the surrender at Appomattox forced them to do, the Southerners have begun to learn that romance is one thing and business

is another. The Southerners are as human as the Northerners, and it is but human to want to prosper. So it is that to-day one sees the Solid South crumbling a bit in its attitude toward the tariff. She is breaking down under the influence of her infant industries. Cotton mills that rival or exceed those of New England; iron factories, comparable in many ways to those in Pennsylvania; phosphate mines, and petroleum wells, not to mention Louisiana's acre after acre of sugar cane, not only are not averse to protection, but are seen actually clamoring for it! The tariff, at last, is coming into its own again as purely an economic problem which applies to the country as a whole. It is no longer a subject of sentimental prejudice in the South,—and yet, in the 70's and as late as the 90's there were Southerners who would have cut off their right arms rather than plead for or be allied with "Yankee protection."

As things now stand, the Southerners, as members of the Democratic party, continue to favor a tariff for revenue only as against protection because such an attitude is a part and parcel of their sentimental tradition. But as the South expands industrially, in the same measure the South actually will lean toward protection. It must be confessed, of course, that the interests in the South that favor protection are scattered more or less. These interests are now to be found in Louisiana where sugar is grown, in the Carolinas where textile mills have been established as branches of New England mills, and the iron and steel industries in Northern Alabama. But the South does not intend to stop expanding, and it would not

be wild to predict that in another quarter of a century the Southern States no longer will be content to accept a "tariff for revenue" in the national Democratic platforms.

Some inkling of how individual Democratic leaders are beginning to see the handwriting on the wall is to be found in a letter written in 1927 by William G. McAdoo, a native of Georgia, to Richard H. Edmonds, of Baltimore, in which he said, in part:

"A tariff based on economic grounds is justifiable, whereas a tariff based upon a system of political rewards, or for the purpose of political advantage, cannot be justified. The Republican party has given us always the latter kind of legislation, and while I admit that certain economic advantages that ought to be secured in any tariff are embraced in the political tariff, yet if the political element were removed the economic advantages would be greater."

It is no heresy to say that Mr. McAdoo voiced a growing sentiment among Southerners to-day. His statement, of course, was that of a politician who was trying to admit a truth without appearing to admit it. It cannot be denied that the Republican tariff embraces "political rewards"; but by the same token, it is not unreasonable to suggest that manufacturers in the South would be no more backward about participating in the rewards than the manufacturers in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. Manufacturers, like Chinamen, are alike under their shirts, whether they live above or below the Mason and Dixon line.

Some Southern business men,—not engaged in manufacturing,—argue that the South will never accept the protective tariff as projected by the Republicans, and point with pride to the Underwood tariff of 1913. This tariff, drafted by Senator Oscar Underwood, of Alabama, lowered the duties in the Payne-Aldrich law on an average of 11 per cent., placing the duties largely upon luxuries, and abolishing the protective rates on nearly all articles. A Southern editor, high up in Democratic party circles, declared that the Underwood tariff bill was “perhaps the most scientific measure of the kind ever framed,” and added that, “it produced big revenues, it ‘protected’ no special interests, and it was not discriminatory to any section. The schedules were fashioned to encourage American industry, and American agriculture, and at the same time not to impose undue exactions upon consumers. The farmer to-day,—especially the cotton producer,—is feeling severely the pinch of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law.”

This sounds convincing enough, but the editor failed to observe that the Underwood tariff law contained provisions for the collection of income and corporation taxes to make up for an estimated \$96,000,000 deficit; and such taxes are as vigorously disliked in the South as they are in the North.

It is noteworthy that the South, according to the census of 1920, produces practically all of this country's cotton and cottonseed products, peanuts, sulphur (three-quarters of the world's output), bauxite, phosphate rock, Fuller's earth, turpentine and resin and carbon black. Now the

Fordney-McCumber tariff law provides duties on various kinds of cotton cloths and on cottonseed oil. It also demands a tariff on peanuts and peanut oil and on sugar and some of its by-products, so that with the duties on metals and manufactures of metals, the Republican tariff actually gives benefit,—if it gives benefit to the North, as the Southerners claim,—to a large portion of the Southern States, as well.

In the circumstances the South, with the inevitable industrial expansion which lies before her, unquestionably, as the years pass, in spite of her hate for anything tainted with the “Yankee” label, is likely to ally herself on the side of protection for her own economic good. As a matter of fact, it would be a bit of fine strategy politically for the Southerners to demand a protective tariff that would be designed for the benefit of the nation as a whole, and not for political favoritism or party advantage; and such a tariff, the more alert business men and manufacturers in the South are beginning to see, is needed as long as the Northern business interests persist in having protection.

The time is not far off, I believe, when the tariff will not be an issue between the North and the South. Economists may not agree on the relative merits of protection, a tariff for revenue only and free trade, but nevertheless, the tariff promises to be a dead issue in so far as it involves the old-time sentimental prejudice which has kept it alive between the Southerners and their neighbors north of the Mason and Dixon line, since the Civil War.

CHAPTER XVIII

ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The economic progress and industrial growth of the South are primarily due to two important causes: cotton and railroads. A great deal has been said and written about the importance of cotton, but I believe a trained economist would attribute to the railroad expansion in the South since the Civil War most of the credit for the South's economic development. While cotton is and has been one of the South's chief commodities, and while the Southern States possess a wealth of raw material in and on their soil, these commodities, to use the triteness of a statistician, could not be utilized for man's purposes without the necessary transportation,—transportation to bring needed materials to the South with which to develop its resources, and transportation with which to carry the South's products to their markets.

Among the many anecdotes about Abraham Lincoln is one which concerns a conversation between the Emancipator and Thomas Scott of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Lincoln was arranging for the transportation of Union troops to the South and sent for Scott. Together they examined a railroad map, and the President was astonished to find that all the great lines, at that time, ran east and west. Transportation southward, he learned, amounted to almost nothing. Whereupon Scott observed, "Mr.

President, if the railroads had run North and South, there would have been no war."

Scott probably was wrong in believing there would have been no war, because transportation would never have solved the slavery question; but it would have solved many of the problems which confronted the South in the days that followed the war. At the same time, the South was not, as Scott's observation would indicate, without railroads. On the contrary, more mileage of railroads was constructed in its borders between 1850 and 1860 than by the New England and Middle Atlantic States combined. In 1850 the South had 2,335 miles of railroad, and New England and the Middle States 4,977. By 1860 the mileage in the South had been increased to 10,713, while the New England and Middle Atlantic States had increased theirs to but 9,510. From 1860 until a year or more before the World War the railroads of the South expanded rapidly, tapping every source of mineral and soil supply in the region; and in 1925 the Southern carriers were reported to have led all the lines in the Union in the earnings on their investments, most of them obtaining 6 per cent., while the railroads of the East earned but 5.19.

In the circumstances the railroads in the South not only have been the chief factors in the economic and industrial progress of the section, but they have done much to heal the breach between the South and North. Naturally, they have been the means of bringing Northern capital into the South. They have been responsible for the erection of factories and industrial plants throughout the region,

financially supported by Northerners; and consequently, they have been indirectly the means of bringing to the South the latest modern methods of business and enterprise, not to mention able Northern business and professional men, whose talents, together with those of the Southerners, have been responsible for the South's economic growth.

As the great wealth of mineral and soil resources of the South were discovered, and as the railroads extended their lines into these rich regions, the South gradually grew away from its dependence upon cotton. That commodity, however, unquestionably was the saving of the South in the first years after the Civil War. Between 1865 and 1880 the cotton business had been developed to such an extent that by the last-named year 16,000 persons found employment in the Southern cotton mills, and their product was nearly one-fourth that of New England. This gave an impetus to the region's industrial growth which carried it into other and larger channels of activity; and to-day the South is second to none in her capacity for supplying raw materials and manufacturing cotton products. Within the last decade she has taken away the cotton manufacturing industry from New England.

While cotton was making some of the Southerners rich, the coal and iron deposits of the Appalachian range were being exploited with the latest kind of machinery. The phosphate beds of Florida, South Carolina and Tennessee were being opened for the preparation of fertilizers. Large fruit orchards were being planted in Florida; and in Louisiana and Texas the swamp lands were being

drained and converted into rice fields which in time became more profitable than those in South Carolina.

Economically, the South for the first fifteen years after the Civil War pulled itself up by its own boot straps. And it was not until the Southerners themselves had revealed the industrial potentialities of the South that the Northern capitalists took an interest in the region. Northern capitalists in those days did not spend their money in enterprises for the mere fun of it. Perhaps they have changed in this respect, as their Winter sojourns in Florida indicate; but not in the days when the South was recovering from the blows of the Civil War.

Statistics are prosaic, but it is not amiss to list the products which are supplied by the South for the needs of the nation,—and the world,—in percentages of one-third or more of the supply of the United States. This will give a better idea than any other how the Southern States have advanced economically since the Civil War, thanks to the enterprise of the Southerners themselves and the financial help, in many cases, of Northerners, not to mention the important help of the railroads.

According to the latest reports,¹ the South to-day is providing 100 per cent. of the country's bauxite, Fuller's earth, turpentine and resin, sugar cane, and peanuts. It is furnishing 99 per cent. of the country's sulphur and phosphate rock. It is providing 93 per cent. of the country's cane syrup and sweet potatoes. It is furnishing 92 per

¹ Pp. 18 and 19, *Blue Book of Southern Progress* for 1922, published by the Manufacturers' Record.

cent. of the country's crude barytes. It is providing 90 per cent. of the country's aluminum and its winter and early spring vegetables. Eighty per cent. of the country's carbon black from natural gas comes from the South. And it is furnishing the country as follows:

Eighty per cent. of the country's rice; 75 per cent. of the natural gasoline; 70 per cent. of the grain sorghums; 66 per cent. of the commercial fertilizers; 61 per cent. of the cabbage; 60 per cent. of the country's natural gas and graphite; 57 per cent. of the country's petroleum; 51 per cent. of the mica; 50 per cent. of the country's butter, lumber and quartz; 48 per cent. of the asbestos; 46 per cent. of the peaches; 45 per cent. of the country's lead; 42 per cent. of the chickens and zinc; 40 per cent. of the asphalt and feldspar; 37 per cent. of the swine; 36 per cent. of the corn and honey; and 33 per cent. of the country's eggs, pyrites, talc and soapstone, and cattle.

In addition to the above, the South is furnishing 26 per cent. of the country's coal, 12 per cent. of the pig iron and 10 per cent. of the iron ore. Also it is furnishing one-fourth of the nation's citrus fruits, berry crop, apples, sugar, milch cows, lime and mineral water.

It is not difficult to see why the railroads in the South are doing a better business than those in the North and East. These materials and products have to be hauled to the markets, and the larger markets are to be found outside the South, including the markets in this country and abroad. In this connection one of the strangest things about the economic growth of the South is the failure of

the Southerners to make Norfolk, Virginia, one of the leading seaports in America, if not in the world, what with the rich feeding area it has in the Southern States.

Since the year 1921, the South has made tremendous strides in highway construction, and this is important because the highways are being used more and more for the truck transportation of freight. This transportation, in some sections, has seriously affected the business of the railroads, and certain small lines, particularly the spurs, have been forced to discontinue their service. How seriously trucking will affect the carriers in the future remains to be seen, but indications are, at this writing, that the progress of the South is such that the railroads and the trucks both can do a big business.

Estimates show that in 1921 the Southern States spent approximately \$150,000,000 on highway construction. This amount was doubled for the year 1925, and, at this writing, more money is being applied to the building of new roads. Some of the States have resorted to large bond issues. North Carolina is a notable example. Other States are adopting the pay-as-you-go plan, as in Virginia, which, it is held by those who advocate it, relieves future generations of financial burdens. Under the bond issue plan, however, North Carolina has outstripped her sister State, Virginia, by a large margin in road building, and to-day boasts of the finest highways in the land. Virginia is building slowly and in a few years ought to have a fine system of roads, comparable to her excellent highway which now runs down the Shenandoah valley.

The railroads and highways naturally are drawing thou-

sands of travelers to the South, so that such States as Florida, North Carolina, Virginia and, in recent times, Mississippi, are the gathering places for thousands of tourists. Florida is leading all Southern States in the tourist business. These visitors are factors in the industrial progress of the South, because they interest Northern capital in Southern enterprises and in Southern possibilities. All this, together with the initiative of the Southerners themselves, has made the section one of the most progressive economically in the last twenty years. The population growths in the leading Southern cities indicate the widespread business activities in the region.

I have stated that the enterprise of the Southerners themselves has had much to do with the South's progress, and this leads me to the Chamber of Commerce and service clubs, notably the Rotarians, in the South. How are they contributing to its growth and progress?

The answer is not an easy one. At the outset, I wish to say that I have neither Henry Mencken's unfavorable opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, nor Sinclair Lewis's burlesque notions of the Rotary Club. There is considerable good to be found in both organizations. But whether the chambers of commerce, the boards of trade, and the service clubs as such have really contributed to the growth and progress of the South is questionable.

A chamber of commerce, as every one knows, is a sort of publicity bureau for a municipality. It engages in the business of "boosting the town," and to do this successfully it usually hires a trained booster as a secretary. Not many years ago there appeared on the American scene a

school for commercial secretaries in which the students were trained in all phases of the technique of boosting. In addition, the United States Chamber of Commerce has sponsored young men who are termed experts in various fields of endeavor, such as wholesale and retail merchandising. I mention these experts because they play an important part in the work of the chamber of commerce secretary.

The commercial secretary has a twofold job. He must boost the town, and he must squeeze enough blood out of the local business turnips to pay his salary. It is but natural, then, for him to be constantly up and doing. He is perpetually mapping out drives for the old town. He is persistently reminding the citizenry that a town is not better than its individuals, and that not one, but all, must put their shoulders to the wheel, and shove the old burg onto the well-known map. To say that his duties make him as busy as a poor widow with a dozen children, is putting it mildly. He must keep his eyes on council, or on the city commission, or the mayor, as the case may be. He must hold up for the gaze of all prospective manufacturers, wholesale merchants, et cetera, in other lands, the inviting swamps and empty lots around the town where great plants and factories might be built, and along which the railroads might build spur tracks, and which the tax assessors might overlook, for a year or two after the visitor arrives to do business.

The chamber secretary, of course, is an advertising genius. He must discover a fitting phrase or slogan to drive home the idea that his town is the only town in

the State,—or in the world. “What Bingville makes, makes Bingville,” he will tell the world.

Moreover, he must organize boosting trips. The package binders and spellbinders must link arms and go into other sections and tell the boys that they will be treated like brothers, if they will come to Bingville to do their trading. Long, tiresome, sweaty journeys are taken to “bring Bingville to the people of the Valley.” And the chamber secretary carries the largest megaphone.

Unquestionably these activities do some good, if it is considered a good thing to bring more factories and more customers to a town. But there is a question as to just how much good a chamber of commerce does. In the first place, every city of size in the South to-day has a chamber or a board of trade, with a wild-eyed secretary whooping it up. Doubtless, some wandering factory-site seeker does land in town to look the possibilities over, and doubtless he is dined,—and perhaps wined,—by the secretary and his associates, and this may influence him into planting a shoe factory on the creek or in building an evil-smelling chemical plant on the river, where even more evil-smelling employees from Northern tenement sections will come to sweat, eat and sleep. But I wonder whether the commercial secretary has really advanced the interests of the South, when it is considered that outside business interests are intelligent enough, in any circumstances, to discover a factory site without assistance. I may be wrong, but I believe the chamber of commerce, in the South, particularly, has made more ineffectual noise than anything else. To its credit, however, it must be said,

that it has promoted interests of the town within the town, by seeing that foolish laws are not passed by the city legislators and that good laws are passed, and by getting behind the municipal authorities in the performance of their proper duties, and shaking a club at them when they do not perform rightly.

The truth probably is that the railroads have expanded, the highways have been built, skyscrapers have been erected, plants have been established, and churches, homes and schools have been constructed, without the builders knowing, more times than not, that the little secretary is swallowing cough drops and yelling his head off at the citizens to be up and doing.

All service clubs, like the darkey in the coon song, look alike. The Rotary Club, however, is the aristocrat of them all. Its *leitmotif* is Service with a capital "S." The carping critics in the Land of Intelligentsia have almost torn the little "Service" banner to threads. Nevertheless, it still waves. It is but natural to think of the Rotary Club in terms of back slapping, song singing and clownish antics; but it must not be forgotten that Rotary, in each community, is composed of the leading men in the professional and business circles. They are the men who, as the chamber secretary would put it, are making the town what it is. If they are a gang of morons, the town will be no better than a village. But if they are up and doing fellows, the town will be the best little old burg this side of the Himalayas.

Broadly speaking, the typical Rotary Club consists of two classes of citizens: wholesale and retail merchants,

bankers and manufacturers in one group, and professional men in the other. As a rule the professional men, that is, the lawyers, doctors and ministers, don't care a hang whether the town grows bigger or not, so long as the country club is not disturbed. And the wholesale and retail merchants, et cetera, don't care a great deal whether the town becomes bigger as long as there is no competition that will interfere with their businesses. So they naturally give their attention to "Service." I believe it is to their credit that they do try to promote square dealing in business, although there is often no outward indication of this. It has been hinted that a Rotarian will take as heavy a profit off a fellow Rotarian as he will off a Kiwanian, and that's saying a good deal! The Rotarians, however, promote the welfare of boys and people in distress. Their work in behalf of boys, alone, justifies their existence. They establish camps and schools for needy boys and are behind such organizations as the Boy Scouts and the Salvation Army. So they can be forgiven, in a measure, for beating plates with heavy knives once a week and yelling their heads off to a marching tune.

I do not believe I speak incorrectly when I say that the Rotarian, as such, has done little or nothing in contributing to the growth and prosperity of the South. This does not mean, of course, that a Rotarian, in his individual rôle, as a business man or a professional, has not played his part in the South's economic advancement; but the average citizen is a far different animal behind an executive's desk in the heat of a busy work day, from the genial would-be Caruso, behind a hotel plate of indigestible

food, at the weekly Rotary luncheon. Rotary, it might be said, has made a Jekyll and Hyde of many a large-paunched gent who would be better off dictating letters to his secretary about the latest shipment of lard.

The Southern Rotarian is not different from his brother in the North. Indeed, it might be said that the typical service club of to-day has done more to heal the wounds of sectionalism than any other agency of its kind. Unfortunately, the churches have not done as much. Consider the Methodists, the Baptists and the Presbyterians. Long before the Civil War they split over the slavery question and have not got together yet. But a Rotarian belongs to a brotherhood that is world-wide in its scope; and a member of the club from Asheville, North Carolina, is as welcome in Keokuk or in Edinburgh, Scotland, as he would be in another Southern community. This spirit undoubtedly has done much to destroy the South's old-time isolation. To-day the grandson of a Confederate soldier whose idea of a Yankee was not unlike his idea of a demon from hell, fraternizes with his Yankee brother, calls him "Bill," and wants to know when he will blow in on the boys down South where he will be treated like a member of the family. In the circumstances, the Rotarians in the South can be forgiven for their clownishness.

One of the most important factors in the progress of the South, next to the construction of railroads and highways, has been the hydro-electric developments in many parts of the South. The Southern States are rich in long potent rivers, from which electric power can be obtained. The result is that large transmission lines are being, and

have been, built, and these furnish power for industries throughout the South, as well as for the towns and cities. Some of the railroads have begun electrifying their lines, and electric interurban lines are being built. If it is true that the large electrical power plants in America are planning to establish a network of transmission lines which will combine all the hydro-electric developments in the country, this will bring the Southern States even more out of their past isolation.

During the past fifteen years Southern farmers have learned a bitter lesson as the result of depending on one crop, and this has been particularly true of the cotton grower. In the seasons when the acreage was large, the prices would fall, and then prices would rise after the farmers inevitably had assumed that smaller acreages were desirable. Suddenly it dawned upon them that the one-crop idea was an unprofitable one; and so, in recent years, they have turned their attention to diversification, with the most gratifying results.

Southern agriculturists are now engaged in dairying, in the raising of poultry, in the breeding of livestock, in the growing of fruits and vegetables and in the growth of foodstuffs generally. The result is that they have fared better. Unfortunately, however, they have been confronted with a problem that has caused them losses in many sections, namely, the problem of labor. In recent years it has been well-nigh impossible to keep young white men on Southern farms. Many of them would prefer to engage in the gentle art of motoring or conducting for street railway companies, to plowing and pitching hay,—

and who can blame them? And the exodus of farm lads to the city is not confined to those who are detached. Young men who would have opportunities to share in the ownership of farms, through inheritance or through their own enterprise, rush to the cities madly.

In spite of the labor problem, though, Southern agriculture is making rapid strides; and according to a recent report was shipping 500,000 carloads of foodstuff alone to feed the people of other sections of America. This does not indicate that even those farmers who are most hard-pressed are on the verge of starvation.

Agriculture in the South has been developed amazingly by the State and Federal authorities, through their agricultural experts. The States send out county agents to instruct farmers who are willing to be instructed in the latest methods of planting and harvesting and in the latest agricultural methods generally. And what is more important, the Southern farmers are learning from experts modern methods of marketing which are making their products more profitable. An enterprising, business-like farmer in the South to-day, who is willing to don overalls and get close to the soil and not ride about his estate like the "gentleman farmer" of old, has a better opportunity to make money from the soil than he ever had before, in spite of the cries for Government relief and in spite of the complaints that come from the so-called "dirt-farmers" from time to time.

In addition to the farm lands that now exist in the South, it is estimated that the section has about 55,000,000 acres of "wet" land of high fertility, which if drained

probably would place the South in the lead of all other sections in the production of agricultural products. But the South can be well content with what she has for a while, if she will but use her possessions and potentialities to the best advantage. She is quite capable, if she wishes, of supplying the cotton and wool clothing for the whole country and much of the world. It probably would be safe to say that she is better off agriculturally than the other sections of America, and this is remarkable when the section's struggles following the Civil War are considered.

To understand the place the Southern States have obtained in the economic life of America, it is not amiss to quote two paragraphs from a recent speech delivered by Walter S. Gifford, president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. Mr. Gifford said:

"The East and North are turning their eyes Southward and are planning to pour many millions of dollars into commercial and industrial projects to be located in the South.

"And the South is grooming itself to meet this outpour of money and this expression of confidence on the part of Northern business men and large corporations and to fulfill every expectation. We are proud of the South and are glad it is coming into its own. It holds the greatest possibilities for development because of its almost unlimited resources, and these are going to bring wealth and prosperity in terms never before dreamed of by the most enthusiastic."

Mr. Gifford, who is a level-headed business man, has hardly exaggerated the South's economic potentialities.

Statistics and tables unending could be cited to show the part the Southern States are playing in the business life of the nation. I believe, however, I have touched on enough of the high spots in the section's economic development to show that the Solid South, phoenix-like, has risen out of the ashes of war ruin and demolition, to an astounding degree. Of course, the section has been aided handsomely by its Northern neighbors. It has been aided by the great railroads which traverse its plains and mountains. Nevertheless, it is to the courage and enterprise of the Southern people themselves and to the fact that the section in which they live is so rich in those things which provide the foods and comforts of man, that credit must be given for the Southland's amazing economic advancement. Perhaps the tonic of economic progress finally will relieve the South of that illness, sectionalism, from which she has so long suffered, for as she advances materially, she will forget the wounds of the past. As she becomes more and more the great provider for the markets of the nation, and of the world, she will give more thought to being an integral portion of a great nation, rather than as a nation within herself, as she has conceived herself to be since Civil War days. This outlook, however, will never come, in spite of the South's material gains, until she has gotten away from her religious and political solidarity; and when that day will come, if it ever comes, no man, at this writing, knows.

CHAPTER XIX

THE FUTURE

In considering the future of the Southern States which formed the Confederacy, four broad aspects must be viewed, namely, the South's economic progress, its religious progress, if any, its political progress, if any, and its social progress. We have seen how the South has advanced in an economic way to an amazing degree. Indeed, the greatest concern a friend of the South might have is that it will grow so rich materially in the next decade or in the next twenty years that it will become as colorless and uninteresting as the North. Struggles against adversities inevitably make a people stand out in nobility of character and heroism, as witness the South for the first twenty years after the Civil War, and the West, following the rush of the Forty-niners to the gold fields. Affluence, on the other hand, breeds a new type of people. In the very nature of things it makes them lazy, lovers of luxury and finally caught with a discontent that does not bring out the best sides of their character. It would be a pity, indeed, to see the South take on the complacency, for example, that the idle rich in the East have assumed for more than a century, and yet, if the South's prosperity of the last two decades continues, that inevitably is what lies in store for her.

The great railroad trunk lines which run up and down and across the South not only have brought to the region new factories and new blood, but have given to the territory visions that are not different in many ways from those that the Easterners long have possessed. The Southerners, as a result of their economic progress, are placing new values on men and things. One example is the weighing of social worth in terms of wealth. The time was, notably in such States as Virginia and South Carolina, when character counted more than dollars. And while that time has not passed altogether, even the people of Virginia and South Carolina are getting away from it. A new order has arisen, as the result of the new era of material progress. As one old Southern gentleman put it a few years ago, "The bottom rail is on top." The people of the middle and lower classes are in power; and aristocracy has taken on a new meaning. The new aristocracy to-day is measured by the ability to make money and keep out of jail. The old aristocracy, as an ideal, is as dead as ancient Rome. As one of the chief results of the economic advancement of the region, the old South soon will lose its identity, save in two things: religion and politics. The South, as I have shown in previous chapters, is one with other sections of America in most of its fashions and manners. The old customs, and many of the old traditions, in so far as individual conduct is concerned, are gradually passing away. And when you add to this the fact that modern methods of business and industry are in the South as conspicuously as they are in the East, you are

confronted with a new South that is vastly different from the South of even twenty years ago.

The religious aspect of the South's future involves so many intricate elements of human nature, and of human passions, that it would be difficult to speculate with any degree of accuracy on how Protestantism will influence the coming generations of Southerners. The influences which are likely to change the religious life of the region are the rapidly growing means of transportation and communication, the increasing influence of the press and education.

Transportation and communication are bringing the people in closer contact with other sections of America, and with the other nations of the world. Moreover, it is bringing more outsiders, with their vastly different viewpoints, into the South. The newspapers, whose circulations are expanding every year, are reaching the remotest spots in the South and are bringing new and potent messages from the outside world. Even the fundamentalists are learning from the press that Darwin did not actually say that man is descended from a monkey. And now and then a Klansman learns the folly of being a clown in a pillow cover and a winding sheet.

It was but a few years ago that Northerners were commiserating the South on her illiteracy. There is no occasion for that now, for the South is probably giving more attention to the problem of education than any other section in America. In 1924, according to preliminary biennial figures issued by the Federal Bureau of Education, the Southern States spent for public education nearly

\$365,000,000, three and a half times the sum it spent for public schools in 1914. When it is remembered that this sum is about \$150,000,000 or 70 per cent. more than the United States spent for schools in 1900, one gets an excellent idea of how the South has awakened in regard to education.

Meanwhile, more money is being spent for the enlargement and improvement of the universities and colleges. The majority of these institutions, it is safe to say, are as modern and liberal as the higher institutions of learning in the East and West. Inevitably they are exerting an influence on the religious life of the South. And while some States here and there are resorting to the ridiculous ban on the teaching of evolution, are insisting that the Protestant Bible be read in the schools, and are using doctored histories, many of them are as modern in their methods and outlook as the schools in the North. It is reasonable to believe, then, that with the larger influence of the universities and colleges, and the growing influence of the public school faculties religion, in time, will be practiced with more tolerance and open-mindedness. But this will not come in a day. It must be a gradual process.

The political future of the South offers the most interesting problem for students of history and for politicians. Since the Civil War, the South has been like the poor relative who has come into the large family to make her home. She is there, but that is all. Nobody pays any attention to her, and she usually sits in the corner and has nothing to say. The South has been the poor relative at the nominating conventions and in the national elec-

tions for years, in so far as having a part in the choice of candidates and measures were concerned. She has had but two weapons, namely, the two-thirds rule and the unit rule. On some occasions she has been able through these rules to prevent nominations she didn't want, but has never been able to select the candidates she did want.

The question that has intrigued politicians in recent years has been, "Will the Solid South ever break?" The only sensible answer is that the day may come when she will break, but it is not near at hand. I have tried to show in a previous chapter the South's attitude toward the Negro problem. It should be remembered that the Republican party in the South is composed largely of Negroes, although the "Lily White" Republicans, in recent years have barred the blacks from their councils. To retaliate the Negroes in some States have organized what they call the "Lily Black" Republicans. The Republican party in the South also has in its ranks, here and there, disgruntled former Democrats. A certain Virginian some years ago was so deeply disappointed because he was not nominated for lieutenant-governor on the Democratic ticket that he turned Republican, and after he died all his descendants became adherents of the party. Northerners who have gone South to live usually are Republicans, and are the best representatives of the party in the South, particularly those who hold high business and executive posts.

As long as the large Negro population remains in the South as compared with the small number of Negroes in the East and West, the South will remain solid politically. Some years ago when the Negroes were emigrating to the

industrial centers in the North in large numbers, a Republican politician expressed the hope that enough Negroes would go North to strike a balance, and that then, he believed, the Solid South would break up politically. But the Negroes returned to the South where the climate suited them better and where they liked the white people better than they liked the Northerners who did not understand them.

Twenty years ago it never occurred to a Southern Negro to become a member of the Democratic party. The story is told that when a Southerner asked his Negro servant, "Joshua, why don't you come over into the Democratic party?" he replied, "Lawsy, Colonel, de Democrats is gentmens, an' I belongs whar dey ain't none." But recently Southern Negroes have tried to join the Democrats because they have received bad treatment from their white brethren in the Republican ranks. So insistent was a Texas Negro to join the party of Jefferson two years ago that when a law in the Lone Star State prohibited Negroes from voting in the Democratic primary, he carried his fight to the United States Supreme Court and the tribunal voided the Texas law.

The Solid South will not break up politically until it is certain beyond a peradventure of a doubt that the Negro has no chance of obtaining political power in the section. I have tried to show in a previous chapter how the Democratic whites in the South bar Negroes from voting through educational tests and other devices. But when the Negro turns to the Republican white he receives no

better treatment. Indeed, he is more deeply offended because he looks upon the G. O. P. as the party of the sainted Emancipator. When the door is shut in his face by the "Lily Whites" he feels it far more keenly than he does when the Democrats hold up their hands to check his advances.

Inasmuch as the Negro every year is becoming educated in larger numbers, what assurance has the South that he will not strive to obtain power, once he realizes his political strength? Upon the correct answer to this question depends the South's political future. I do not believe, as some Southerners do, that such issues as prohibition, Catholicism or the tariff will cause the Solid South to break politically. The South, it must be confessed, is at this writing dry politically. Also it is overwhelmingly Protestant. And it must be admitted that in a Democratic national convention the Southern delegation could be counted on to fight vigorously and to the end, the aspirations of a "wet" or a Catholic, or both.

But this would not mean that the South would break in the event a wet or a Catholic were nominated. All that the South would demand of the candidate would be that he must be a white man. And, in such an event, the South would vote for a wet or Catholic nominee, as it has for Democratic nominees since the Civil War. There would be dissenters. There might be enough of them to create a sizable third dry party in the South, but it would amount to nothing on election day. The border States, notably Kentucky and Tennessee, could not be counted

on, one way or the other. Their votes in the past have been uncertain on less important issues than prohibition and Catholicism.

One important thing to remember about the political dryness of the Southern States is the fact that the people of the South are as wet individually as the people in other sections of the country. I have shown in an earlier chapter how the larger cities are as wet as those in the North, and how drinking is just as prevalent among the young people in the South as in the North. It is reasonable to believe, then, that the people, as a whole, and as individuals, do not care a great deal about the dry laws. But it must be admitted that the politicians, under the whip of the Protestant hierarchy, profess dryness with a piety that would have done credit to Saul after his conversion.

Save in the remote sections of the South where ignorance predominates, I believe there is becoming more evident among the Protestant leaders a disposition to study out the truth about Catholicism. The press and the nation's weekly and monthly periodicals are enlightening them, in some measure, and they are learning that the Catholic church in America to-day is a far different affair from the church in the time of the Spanish Inquisition. It may be a long time coming, but I believe the day will come when even a really educated Methodist bishop in the South will recognize the fact that the Pope has no intention of sneaking in the back door of the White House and setting up a super-government. Already the better educated Protestant laymen are recognizing the idiocy of such a notion, so that in the event a Catholic should be nominated by the

Democrats for President, I do not believe the event would cause the Solid South to break. There would, of course, be some wailing and weeping and gnashing of teeth among the bishops and superintendents in the Methodist ranks and among some of the divine doctors in the Baptist ministry, but generally speaking the Southern electorate would support the nominee,—providing, as I have said, that he is a white man.

In the larger business circles, particularly in the manufacturing spheres, Southern opinion on the tariff question is changing, as I have noted. But this, I believe, will not affect the political solidarity of the South. There are more ways than one of killing a political cat, and no group of business men in the country is more adept at killing political cats than the manufacturers, wherever they may be found. Those manufacturers in the South who believe in a protective tariff can very easily call themselves "Protective Democrats." Consider how the good Democrats in 1924 deserted Mr. Wilson on the League of Nations issue, but to all intents and purposes were still with him. "Protective Democrats" in the South could hardly wander away from the fold further than did the "referendum Democrats" in 1924. It was fortunate, at any rate, that Mr. Wilson was not alive to witness the machinations of the advocates of a "referendum."

Some years ago the Baltimore *Evening Sun* staged a prize contest involving the question, "What is the difference between a Democrat and a Republican?" A woman in Baltimore gave the winning answer. She said that, "A Democrat is one who believes the Republican party is

crooked and a Republican is one who believes the Democratic party is crooked. Both are right." There are many persons in the South to-day who see the two parties as this woman does. They recognize the fact that essentially and fundamentally there is really no difference between America's two dominant parties. There is in the South a sizable body of independents who are disgusted with both parties. But this must be borne in mind: the Southern independents invariably vote the Democratic ticket, or they do not vote at all. They would prefer doing one or the other to voting the Republican ticket, simply as a matter of sentiment, and to adhere to lifelong traditions.

Social conditions in the South are becoming more and more like those of other sections of America. Petty and major crimes are on the same scale in the more populous centers. Violation of the prohibition law is not solely a Southern practice by any means. Nor is murder confined to the South, as the daily record of Chicago discloses. But the South still bears the reputation of being the leading section in the number of lynchings. These crimes are the works of lawless mobs; and although the number of lynchings has decreased within the past ten years, there are still too many of them.

Mob psychology in the South is a far different kind of psychology from that in the North. I was amused at reading an editorial in the *New York World* in the Spring of 1927 commending the heroism of a Gotham policeman who "prevented" a mob of angry New Yorkers from

lynching a Negro who had attacked a white man. The cop would have had an entirely different problem to deal with in the South. The mob in the South not only is born of the anger and passion of the moment, but of a lifelong tradition, and that tradition is that a Negro, or a white man, must be punished forthwith when he commits rape or murder, and particularly when the rape or murder is of a heinous degree. Court trials and delays, in the eyes of the lynchers, are too unsatisfactory.

Two things, and I believe those two things alone, will prevent mob violence in the South. One is the gradual education of the type of Southerner who takes part in a lynching, and the other is a proper safeguard for a prisoner in the first place or the prompt action of the authorities in the second. Such a law as Congressman Dyer proposed would be as ineffectual in the South as throwing snowballs at Eskimos. The Dyer bill provides for the imposition of heavy fines upon communities and the punishment of officials who permit mobs to seize prisoners.

Twenty years ago men in high official life, such as the governors of States themselves, approved, more or less, of lynching. All that has changed. The State and minor authorities in all the Southern commonwealths are bent upon maintaining order at all costs. Incidents in recent years in such States as Virginia, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi and North Carolina have disclosed that mob violence will not be tolerated by the properly constituted authorities. And in States where the authorities are disposed to be in sympathy with members of a mob, as re-

cently in South Carolina, the press in and out of the South raise loud protests. These protests invariably result in action being taken against the lynchers.

In the circumstances, I believe that this kind of lawlessness, for which the South unfortunately is famed, will be curbed in time by the Southerners themselves. Not only moral and social but political and economic considerations, will force them to prevent mob violence. More often than not business interests are hurt by the actions of lawless bands. And office-holding politicians are beginning to realize that the thinking people in the South will not retain in power an official who fails to act promptly and justly when mob violence has been indulged in.

The South to-day is under the spotlight of universal gaze. Enterprising business and professional men from other sections are turning their eyes toward her borders. Persons who are seeking home sites in a land that has an excellent year-around climate are beginning to move to her mountains and plains. Even across the seas the South, particularly Florida, is becoming known to the world. The saga of Virginia, and of the South, is known to the Mother Country through the prideful utterances of such persons as Lady Nancy Astor, a native of the Southland, who now sits in the British Commons.

Such a spotlight inevitably discloses the weaknesses and the strength of the South. The world outside not only is learning the potentialities and the mistakes of the section, but the Southerners themselves are beginning to see themselves as others see them. The process of improve-

ment must be gradual; but that conditions, religiously, politically and socially, as well as economically, will improve, is as certain as that the same conditions will improve in America as a whole. Meanwhile the South has many traits that other sections well might adopt. I believe I am not mistaken in saying that her people are the most warm-hearted in America. Not even the breezy Westerners are more so. Her potentialities for greatness and goodness exist in as large a degree as any other section; and her capacity for heroism already is an established story in the world's literature.

But, I believe, provided the South does not succumb to the crass materialism that has taken the blood and color out of the East, the consummation of her future lies in becoming a more integral part of the American scene. Climate and terrain, as science long ago discovered, makes peoples of different sections different in their customs and manners; and because of her climate and her mountains and plains, the South probably always will be different from the North and East.

But the fulfillment of her destiny lies in her becoming a bit more American, in getting away more from the ancient intolerances and narrowness which have bound her so long. And when she has done this, I do not believe it would be speculating too wildly to say that in some future day she might become as potent in guiding the destinies of the nation as she was before the Civil War.

APPENDIX

THE SOUTH IN 1928?

In facing the task of choosing a Democratic candidate for the presidency in 1928, the Southern Democrats will go to the party's national convention with problems far different from those which confronted them in 1924. That year they were able, through the two-thirds and unit rules, to prevent the nomination of Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York, although they were not able to force the nomination of their favorite, William G. McAdoo, or of their favorite sons, Carter Glass and Oscar Underwood.

In 1928, Mr. McAdoo will have faded from the scene as a potential candidate. His most ardent supporters in the South recognize the fact that he can never be nominated. All the political circumstances which could be stacked against a Presidential aspirant are stacked against the former Secretary of the Treasury. His services as counsel for the oil interests are against him. His dryness is not to the liking of the Northern and Eastern Democrats. And his personality is strongly disliked by many thousands of others.

While Mr. McAdoo's star has descended, Governor Smith's has risen. Elected Governor of New York for the fourth time, in 1926, and with a record of unusual achievement as an executive and a leader, Mr. Smith is

to-day unquestionably the strongest leader Democracy possesses. Southern Democrats recognize his political eminence. They recognize his ability to obtain votes. They know, as much as many of them hate to know it, that he is the one man in America to-day who can win a Democratic victory if he receives solid Democratic support. Added to Mr. Smith's support which he will receive from the large body of anti-prohibitionists, is a growing conviction among Democrats, including some in the South, that his affiliation with the Catholic church should be no bar to his entering the White House. His recent letter, printed in the *Atlantic Monthly*, in which he set forth his status as an American citizen and as a member of his church, has set at rest the fears that thinking people in his party might have had. Save in the lower reaches of the South,—and in some sections of the North as well,—the Smith credo of American citizenship is satisfying.

But the South's opposition to Mr. Smith in the 1928 convention will be fourfold. And the Southern Democrats will seize upon all of these or one or more of the four reasons for opposing him, to defeat him in the convention. Governor Smith will be opposed by the Southern Democrats because he is considered "wet," because he is a Catholic, because he is a member of Tammany Hall and because he was born and reared in the wicked city of New York. Those Southerners and those newspapers who may be satisfied with his credo of American citizenship will oppose him because he is wet. Or some of those who are wet themselves will oppose him because he is

allied with Tammany, or because he is a New Yorker. Above all, in spite of his promulgated credo of citizenship, hundreds of Democrats in the South will oppose him because of his religion. In their minds will remain the belief, in spite of what Mr. Smith has said to the contrary, that he will permit the Pope to dictate to him if he ever enters the White House. And this belief, one may rest assured, will be reinforced by the utterances of the brethren, who see in the Smith credo a "mere attempt to cover up his real tracks," or the Pope's tracks, as the case may be.

So the Southerners will fight Alfred E. Smith in the 1928 convention to the last ditch. If worse comes to worst they will be willing to accept the wet Governor Albert C. Ritchie of Maryland in preference to Smith. They probably would be willing to accept the irrepressible and exceedingly wet Senator "Jim" Reed of Missouri, if they found that they could block Smith with no other man. They know they can never hope to stop him by putting McAdoo against him again, so they are shelling the woods and tramping the plains in search of a candidate who can make a decent stand against the New York Governor.

The result is that dark horses and favorite sons will be more plentiful in 1928 than they were in 1924. Some Southerners are disposed to receive kindly the suggestion of Northern Democrats that Owen D. Young be put forward as the best candidate with which to defeat Governor Smith. But Mr. Young, in the eyes of many Southerners, who still retain the Bryan attitude toward Wall

Street and its subsidiaries, is too tainted with "big business." Besides they believe they have men in their own borders who are as capable of administering the affairs of the nation as Mr. Young.

Alabama, although in the grip of the political wing, controlled by the present Governor, Bibb Graves, is hardly likely to put Oscar Underwood forward again. However, if the State puts any favorite son before the convention, it will be Mr. Underwood, because there is no other man in the State who could logically be nominated. Arkansas has an able favorite in the person of Senator Joseph T. Robinson and probably will present his name long enough to make a suitable trade. North Carolina has an exceptionally able favorite son in the person of Governor Angus W. McLean, and his name undoubtedly will be before the convention until a suitable switch can be negotiated. Down in Texas the youthful Governor Dan Moody's stock has risen considerably in recent months, and the Texans unquestionably will advance his name until they can find a suitable candidate.

One of the outstanding favorite sons from the South in 1928 will be Governor Harry F. Byrd of Virginia. At this writing, indications are that he, and not Senator Glass, will be put forward as the Old Dominion's choice. For the first time in several generations Virginia has an executive in this youthful governor who shows the fire and ability of the Virginia statesmen of old. He is a fine business man, enterprising and possesses a rare leadership which he has exerted in behalf of many excellent governmental and legislative reforms in his State. In his na-

tive commonwealth his stock has steadily risen, until now he appears to be more popular than Senator Glass and far more popular than any Governor Virginia has had in the past fifty years.

In addition to Owen D. Young, who probably will be advanced by Eastern friends, and "Jim" Reed who will receive scattering support, the Southern Democrats will be in the position to add to their favorite son list two outstanding men in the Middle West, namely, E. T. Meredith and Governor Vic Donahey of Ohio. Of the four men, Young, Meredith, Reed and Donahey, the Ohioan will be the most acceptable to the South because of his dryness.

In the circumstances the stage is set, I believe, for a free-for-all fight in the Democratic convention in 1928 that will transcend the 1924 gathering in vigor and bitterness. The Klan issue is not as strong now as it was in 1924, but it is not dead by any means. Nor is the religious issue eliminated from Democratic councils. Unfortunately, this issue is destined to tear and wreck the party for many election years to come. And the prohibition issue is perennial. Perhaps it will never die. It is safe to say, at any rate, that it is destined to be the chief issue before the 1928 convention, and is likely to affect the results of the election in so far as the Democrats are concerned. So, if Alfred E. Smith, a "wet," a Catholic and a member of Tammany is nominated, the nation may look for dissension in Democratic ranks again, probably as great as that which appeared in 1924 as the result of Demo-

cratic alarm in some quarters over the so-called "La Follette menace."

But this should be borne in mind: the dissension will not be among the Democrats in the South. I firmly believe that in spite of any opposition he may have in the convention, Governor Smith, if nominated, will receive the support of the Solid South. There may be in the South, particularly in such States as Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia and Mississippi a strong falling off in the Democratic vote, but I believe every Southern State would enter the Smith column.

Such an event would appear strange in view of the fact that preconvention and convention opposition to Smith would be stronger among Southern delegates than among those in the North, East and West. But, as I have attempted to show in previous chapters, the South would be almost as reluctant to desert Democracy as it would be to desert Protestantism,—and that is saying a great deal. So long as the Democratic nominee is a white man, the South would remain loyal to Democracy. This would mean that if Governor Smith is nominated in 1928, his fitness as a candidate would be justified in the many artful ways which politicians and spellbinders have of justifying such things after the smoke of nominating battles have cleared away. Politics, after all, rarely follows the paths of reason, justice and consistency. Consider, for example, the attitude of a Pennsylvania newspaper toward Senator-elect William S. Vare. In Philadelphia a Republican newspaper was so outspoken in its opposition to

Mr. Vare during the primary campaign that it unhesitatingly condemned him as a misfit who should never be seated in the Senate. But when Vare had been nominated and was opposed by an able Democrat, this same newspaper supported Vare. Such a course is what the politicians call "political expediency"; and Madame Roland's famous observation about the crimes that have been committed in liberty's name apply most eloquently to such a philosophy.

"After all," the Southern Democrats will say, in the event Mr. Smith is nominated, "the man is a good Democrat,—and he's a white man. We've never deserted the party since Lee's men went home in rags, so we won't do so, now." But it will not be altogether a matter of sentiment with the Southerners. As much as they may hate the term, "expediency" also will guide them. They know they cannot afford, after a long and successful political fight for white supremacy in the South where the Negro population predominates, to permit the South to be split up politically. The mercurial actions of the border States in elections are not really important; but it would be a serious thing for the traditionally Democratic States in the South to desert the party which has meant so much to them for many years. Governor Smith's wetness, his Catholicism, his nativity in wicked New York and his affiliation with that questionable organization, Tammany, would not justify a surrender to the Republicans in the South, which, in time, might mean a surrender to the Negroes.

The philosophy of expediency would receive its chief

support from the bosses of the Democratic political machines in the South. And Tammany itself is no stronger than these organizations. The bosses of these machines include some of the outstanding citizens in the counties, towns, cities and States. Senators, governors, State officials, city and county officials, legislators, et cetera, all belong to these machines which have been in power so long that it would be difficult to blow them out with a blast of dynamite. Inasmuch as their political bread and meat depend on the maintenance of Democracy, they naturally will make it their business to see that the Democratic nominee, whether he be Alfred E. Smith or the illustrious Mr. Chaplin, of Hollywood, receives the solid Democratic vote in their bailiwicks.

Consider the case, say, of a Senator, and I know one who has probably the strongest and best organized political machine in the South. Such a man is not going to permit the wet issue, the Catholic issue or any other issue to prevent him from returning to the Senate, or what is almost as important, to cause his grip on the machine to weaken. The result is that if Governor Smith should be nominated, this Senator would send out instructions which would reach the remotest points in his State to the effect that the Democratic Presidential nominee must be supported at all hazards. And he would be obeyed. There might be some dissenters, but not enough of them to affect the Democratic majority. Each wheel within the machine is dependent upon another and larger wheel; and the time was, not so many years ago, when a State boss and his subordinates could count with certainty on de-

livering a victory-winning block of votes to the candidate who had been chosen by the machine leaders.

I do not wish to give the impression that there are no independent voters in the South. There probably are hundreds of them; but as I have said before if they go to the polls they invariably let sentiment guide them and vote the Democratic ticket, or they do not vote at all. Moreover, the independents in the South, as everywhere else in America, are unorganized. If they should become organized, as they sometimes are into reform groups whose chief reason for existence is a grievance, they soon take the rôle of an ineffectual third party. And third parties somehow or other do not survive in the South. They meet with the fate that such organizations have suffered throughout the history of the Republic. Without effective leadership and without organization, the independent voters in the South have no power whatever and therefore no voice in the choice of men and measures. The result is that any opposition they might show to Governor Smith would be ineffectual against the determination of the machine bosses to give the New Yorker support.

There are probably many persons in the South to-day who, although they are vigorously opposed to Smith's nomination, not only realize that he has a good chance of being nominated, but recognize his ability and integrity. Such persons naturally are adjusting their minds and tastes more and more toward Smith. Carter Glass is an example. He is ardently dry, and he is strongly opposed to Tammany. But recognizing the possibility that

Smith may be nominated, he is preparing himself for the eventuality. In a public statement early in 1927 he declared that he believed Virginia would support Smith if he is nominated. In 1924 when McAdoo was at the height of his popularity, such a statement would have been received in the Old Dominion as heresy. Glass and other Southerners of intelligence see the handwriting on the wall. They know down in their hearts that McAdoo is as dead politically as the well-known king. And they know that Smith is stronger to-day than any Democrat has been since the Civil War. Woodrow Wilson was not as strong in 1912. He won as a dark horse after Bryan's memorable attack on Champ Clark. And Wilson would never have been elected if Roosevelt had not split the Republican party. Before the Democratic convention in 1912 Wilson was hardly known outside New Jersey. To-day Smith is nationally known; and he is admired by Republicans as well as Democrats in his own State.

I believe Smith has an excellent chance of being nominated in 1928. All indications point to his selection at this writing. He will not be supported by the South in the convention; and if he is nominated it will not be until after one of the bitterest fights the Democrats have ever staged. In the event he is nominated, the South, I believe, will support him solidly, possibly with some falling off in the Democratic vote. So a Democratic victory in 1928, in the event of his nomination, depends upon whether the dry and anti-Catholic Democrats in the East, the Middle West and the West support the New York executive as loyally as the Solid South would support him.

WITHDRAWN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
The University of Memphis

SEP 1965
E

WITHDRAWN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
The University of Memphis

F
289
R65

54227

Robertson

The changing south

LIBRARY
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

